DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 386 HE 029 062

AUTHOR	Barefoot, Betsy O.; Fidler, Paul P.
TITLE	The 1994 National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programs: Continuing Innovations in the Collegiate Curriculum. The Freshman Year Experience Monograph Series No. 20.
INSTITUTION	South Carolina Univ., Columbia. National Resource Center for the Freshman Year Experience and Students in Transition.
PUB DATE	96
NOTE	97p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; Basic Writing; College Bound Students; College Curriculum; *College Freshmen; Communication Skills; *Course Content; *Course Organization; Higher Education; Mathematics Skills; National Surveys; Reading Skills; School Orientation; *Student Development
IDENTIFIERS	*Freshman Seminars

ABSTRACT

This monograph presents data from a 1994 national survey on freshman seminars gathered from 1,003 accredited, two- and four-year colleges with student populations of over 100 students. The survey investigated the content and structure of freshman seminars in a mail survey of provosts/vice presidents for academic affairs at 2,460 institutions Among responding institutions, 723 institutions reported they already offered a freshman seminar and 56 institutions were planning such a seminar. The most common seminar types found were: extended orientation, academic orientation with uniform academic content, academic orientation on various topics, professional or discipline-based orientation, and basic study skills-oriented orientation. Many institutions indicated they offered a hybrid of these types. Most freshman seminars had 25 or fewer students. Analyses provide information on seminar goals and topics, enrollment, grading, linkage to other courses, instructional style, instructor training and compensation, and evaluation/assessment. Qualitative analyses illustrate the five seminar types at five particular schools--Longwood College (Virginia), Union College (New York), Carleton College (Minnesota), Wharton School (University of Pennsylvania), Santa Fe Community College (New Mexico). Results are compared to previous surveys done in 1988 and 1991. Appendixes include the survey instrument and a listing of institutions currently offering freshmen seminars. (Contains 26 references.) (NAV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Monograph Series
Number 20

THE FRESHMAN YEAR EXPERIENCE®

ED 393 386

THE 1994 NATIONAL SURVEY OF FRESHMAN SEMINAR PROGRAMS:

CONTINUING INNOVATIONS IN THE COLLEGIATE CURRICULUM

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

University of S.C.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 029 062

BETSY O. BAREFOOT
PAUL P. FIDLER

National Resource Center for
The Freshman Year Experience & Students in Transition
University of South Carolina, 1996

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Monograph Series
Number 20

THE FRESHMAN YEAR EXPERIENCE®

THE 1994 NATIONAL SURVEY OF FRESHMAN SEMINAR PROGRAMS:

CONTINUING INNOVATIONS IN THE COLLEGIATE CURRICULUM

BETSY O. BAREFOOT
PAUL P. FIDLER

National Resource Center for
The Freshman Year Experience & Students in Transition
University of South Carolina, 1996

Special gratitude is expressed to the Editorial Assistants for the National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience & Students in Transition: Randolph F. Handel for cover design and layout, and Scott D. Bowen for proof editing.

Copyright 1996 by the University of South Carolina. All rights reserved.
No part of this work may be reproduced or copied in any form, by any means, without written permission from the University of South Carolina.

The Freshman Year Experience® and The First-Year Experience® are trademarks of the University of South Carolina. A license may be granted upon written request to use these terms. This license is not transferable without the written approval of the University of South Carolina.

Contents

Foreword iii

Chapter One: Introduction 1

Study Background 1
Study Process and Objectives 2
Reading the Monograph 3

Chapter Two: An Historical and Theoretical Framework for the Freshman Seminar 5

A Brief History 5
Linking Scholarship to Practice in the Freshman Seminar 6
Conclusion 9

Chapter Three: Survey Results and Analyses 11

Description of Respondents by Key Variables 11
Description of Freshman Seminars 11
Seminar Goals and Topics 12
Maximum Section Enrollment 13
Method of Grading 17
Freshman Seminar as a Required Course 19
Linkage of Seminar to Other Courses 21
Academic Credit Applicable to Graduation 22
Amount of Academic Credit 23
Application of Academic Credits 25
Special Seminar Sections for Student Sub-Populations 27
Seminar Instruction 28
Role of Freshman Seminar Instructor as Academic Advisor 31
Freshman Seminar Instructor Training 32
Administrative Assignment of Seminar Teaching Load 34
Compensation for Teaching Freshman Seminar as an Overload or Extra Responsibility 36

Evaluation of Freshman Seminar Outcomes 37
Publication of Research Results 40
Longevity of the Freshman Seminar 40
Institutional Support for the Freshman Seminar 43
Summary 45
General Findings 45
Analyses by Type of Institution 46
Analyses by Level of Enrollment 47
Analyses by Type of Seminar 48
A Longitudinal Comparison of Survey Results 49

CHAPTER FOUR: QUALITATIVE FINDINGS 53

The Extended Orientation Seminar: Longwood College 53
The Academic Seminar with Common Content Across Sections: Union College 54
Academic Seminars on Various Topics: Carleton College 55
Professional Seminar - Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania 56
Basic Study Skills Seminar: Santa Fe Community College 57
Other Seminars with Unique Characteristics 58

EPILOGUE 61

APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT 63

APPENDIX B: AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES REPORTING FRESHMAN SEMINARS-1994 67

REFERENCES 91

Foreword

John N. Gardner

Twenty-two years ago, when I became director of the fledgling first-year seminar program (University 101) at the University of South Carolina, there were no professional development opportunities for first-year educators. There was no literature base, no professional meeting I could attend to meet other seminar directors or instructors, and no textbook written exclusively for freshman seminar courses. Finally, there was no serious research being done to measure the extent of interest and response to assisting first-year students. How things have changed in 22 years!

Now there is a significant body of literature on first-year programming, especially the freshman seminar, much of it developed or sponsored by my colleagues in the National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience and Students in Transition. Now there are many conferences, workshops, and seminars focusing on first-year students that allow me and my fellow educators around the country to share research and practice on behalf of first-year students.

As I have come to know educators who work with first-year students, I have learned that in some ways we are like the first-year students themselves. We want to be able to place ourselves in a national context. We want to know if what we are doing, thinking, or feeling is similar to the experience of our colleagues at other colleges and universities. Some of us want to know, "What is Harvard doing? Does Harvard offer a freshman seminar?" Of course the answer to those questions was found in the extraordinary interview that we conducted with David Riesman of Harvard, published in Volume 3, Number 2 of the *Journal of The Freshman Year Experience.*

I realized many years ago that many educators who had been spending enormous amounts of energy in developing their freshman seminar courses wanted to know how their efforts fit into the larger national and historical context of this unique curriculum reform. This publication will certainly help all of us see where and how our program fits into a number of different national contexts.

I want to express my personal and professional gratitude to the two monograph authors: Betsy Barefoot who currently serves as a Co-Director for the National Resource Center, and Paul Fidler who has been my colleague here at the University of South Carolina for 26 years. Since 1974, he has been the researcher primarily responsible for the ongoing study of our University 101 freshman seminar. Together, these authors have written about this research in a way that I believe will assist and inform many freshman seminar instructors and program directors in the creation and re-creation of viable seminar programs for first-year students.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

If you have selected this monograph, you are most likely an educator who has some familiarity with or curiosity about the freshman seminar (a.k.a., student success course, college survival course, freshman colloquium, etc.). Your knowledge of these courses may be extensive or it may be based upon one or two campus-specific models which have gained national prominence or with which you are familiar. This monograph is intended to expand your conceptual framework of what is or what might be a freshman seminar, with respect to both structure and content, by providing an up-to-date review of quantitative and qualitative information about these courses.

These data are the result of a national survey of freshman seminars undertaken in the fall of 1994 by the National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience and Students in Transition. It is the third in a series of national surveys of freshman seminars conducted by the Center (previous surveys were conducted in 1988 and 1991) and is designed to build upon previous findings to provide an accurate, longitudinal picture of the numbers and characteristics of these courses.

Study Background

The "stock" of the American freshman has risen dramatically in the recent past. In its most recent issue of *Campus Trends*, the American Council on Education (1995) reports that in 1995, 82% of colleges and universities "have taken steps to improve the freshman year," compared to only 37% in 1987 (p. 7). These "steps" for improving the freshman year may take many forms including the linking of residence life to academic experience, the establishment of administrative structures that offer centralized services to first-year students, and the intentional establishment of mentoring relationships with faculty, staff, or upper-level students (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1995). But, by far, as these survey data indicate, the most common structure being implemented to improve the freshman year is the freshman seminar.

A number of converging circumstances, both internal and external to higher education, have brought about an increased interest in the fate of first-year students and, consequently, interest in the freshman seminar. These circumstances include the following:

1. Persistent concerns about the alarming rate of freshman-to-sophomore attrition;

2. An increasing influx of first-generation, under-represented, and academically underprepared students, many of whom lack not only essential academic skills but also knowledge about higher education—its unique language, culture, ethos, and expectations;

3. Broad-based public criticism of the quality of undergraduate education and the treatment of new students, especially in the large research university;

4. The genuine concern of faculty, staff, and administrators for the academic and social well-being of first-year students.

These concerns among others are requiring that campuses take additional steps to provide information and assistance to first-year students—the kind of information and assistance which often fall outside the traditional curriculum.

Freshman seminars may be offered on virtually any topic, depending upon decisions made by curriculum committees or by a single faculty member who serves as seminar instructor. But as the data indicate, the common purpose of all these courses is to facilitate what Vincent Tinto (1993) has termed the academic and the social integration of students. Through the freshman seminar, students are provided a small "community of learners" who become friends, they have the opportunity to practice the academic skills essential for college success, and they are provided a classroom structure in which social interaction is the norm rather than the exception. Interaction and mutual support comprise the essence of the seminar; without those essential processes, these courses lose their power to affect positively the success, satisfaction, and retention of first-year students.

Study Process and Objectives

In the fall of 1994, the National Resource Center surveyed all regionally accredited colleges and universities in the United States with a student population of over 100 (N = 2,460). The survey instrument was mailed to all provosts/vice presidents for academic affairs. Survey responses were received from 1,003 colleges and universities for an overall response rate of 40.7%. Of the 1,003 responding institutions, 723 (71.8%) indicated that a freshman seminar is offered. An additional 56 respondents noted that their institution plans to offer a freshman seminar in the 1995-96 academic year.

Consistent with 1991 National Survey findings, the most common seminar types are the following:

1. *Extended orientation seminars.* Sometimes called freshman orientation, college survival, or student success courses, these courses are taught by faculty, administrators, student affairs professionals, graduate and upper-level undergraduate students. Specific content varies widely but is likely to include an introduction to campus resources, time management, study skills, career planning, diversity, and issues common to student life.

2. *Academic seminars with generally uniform academic content across sections.* These courses may be elective or required, inter- or extra-disciplinary in focus, and will sometimes be a part of the required general education core. These courses often focus on the "higher order"academic skills such as critical thinking, analysis, and argument.

3. *Academic seminars on various topics.* In this type of seminar, each section will consider a different topic chosen by the faculty member who is the seminar instructor. These courses may evolve from any discipline. Students generally select their first- or second-choice seminar. In this genre, class size is often restricted to no more than 15 students.

4. *Professional or discipline-based seminars.* These seminars may be offered in any academic department or professional school (engineering, nursing, agriculture) and are designed to give

students a basic introduction to the academic expectations and professional applications of the major.

5. *Basic study skills seminars.* These seminars provide some degree of remediation for students who are academically unprepared and focus on the most basic study skills such as reading, dictionary use, note-taking, and basic writing.

In the 1994 survey, a number of responses indicated an intentional linking of seminar types 2 and 3; these seminars have an overall common theme within which instructors are free to choose subthemes. In addition, it is important to note that these five categories are seldom mutually exclusive. Many respondents indicated that their institution's seminar is a hybrid of sorts—a coming together of several of the defined seminar types. Finally, there were the inevitable "other" seminars—those which could not be placed into any of the most common five categories.

Reading the Monograph

Continue your reading with Chapter Two if you are interested in a brief history of the freshman seminar and its theoretical underpinnings.

If your primary interest is in the data, Chapter Three presents survey findings in tabular form with respect to a number of variables: goals, content, structures, administration, instruction, longevity, administration, campus support, etc. These data are presented (a) across all institutions regardless of type, (b) by size of institution, (c) by two-year versus four-year institution, and (d) by seminar type for four of the five categories. (Responses in the "Professional/Discipline-Based Seminar" category were too few for accurate data comparison.)

Detailed qualitative information about selected freshman seminar programs is presented in Chapter Four, and our concluding observations and recommendations are offered in a short Epilogue.

Appendices include the survey instrument and a list of the responding institutions that offer freshman seminars.

Thank you for your interest in this publication. We invite your comments and further questions, and we encourage you to share with the National Resource Center information about your unique campus-based programs for first-year students.

Chapter Two

An Historical and Theoretical Framework for the Freshman Seminar

A Brief History

Discussing the history of freshman seminars as a course type presents a number of challenges. First is the challenge of terminology. "Freshman seminar" is a term that has been used to describe two primary types of courses—the first focusing on providing students an extended orientation to the campus and the world of higher education, and the second replicating a more traditional academic seminar in which students work with faculty on a specific academic topic of common interest. Today many freshman seminars attempt to combine transition issues and academic content; however, historical records indicate that the vast majority of freshman seminars were begun with one or the other as a primary focus (Gordon, 1989).

The second challenge is locating the historical records themselves, many of which are buried in curriculum committee reports or course catalogs of the 19th and early 20th century. Fitts and Swift (1928) maintain that the first freshman seminar for which the focus was extended orientation began at Boston University in 1888. However, this very survey has unearthed an older extended orientation freshman seminar—one that reportedly began at Lee College in Kentucky in 1882. Levine (1985) traces the history of the academic freshman seminar to a much later date, 1945, and defines it as "a pedagogical technique introduced by Nathan Pusey at Lawrence College which provides freshmen an opportunity to work with a faculty member on a topic of mutual interest" (p. 525).

Since their precise beginning, whenever and wherever that might have taken place, the number of extant freshman seminars has waxed and waned, "virtually disappearing" in the 1960s when American higher education was truly a seller's market and the prevailing educational philosophy was "sink or swim" (Gordon, 1991). The primary growth of this course type has come since the mid-1970s in response to the many challenges, both fiscal and academic, faced by American colleges and universities. Decreasing numbers of traditional-age students, demographic shifts in the entering student population, a commitment to access for students previously excluded from higher education, the alarming student dropout rate which peaks between the freshman and sophomore year, a renewed concern about the quality of undergraduate education—all these issues have converged to generate increased interest in the first college year and curricular programs that ease the transition of students into college life.

In spite of survey evidence that many institutions continue to initiate freshman seminars of various types in response to any or all of the preceding concerns, the overall percentage of these courses in American colleges and universities (approximately 67%) has remained fairly constant since 1988 (National Resource Center, 1988, 1991, 1994) This may indicate that as freshman seminars are born, others die an untimely death for a variety of reasons

which can be summarized as lack of firm institutional support. Levine and Weingart (1974) offer a partial explanation for the problems that often accompany implementation of a freshman seminar. They argue that freshman seminars, in addition to other general education courses may become a "spare room" that is poorly attended and indiscriminately used in the "house of intellect" (Boyer & Levine, 1981, p. 1). Traditional institutional reward systems often do not favor the teaching of courses that are "extradisciplinary"—outside of traditionally defined academic disciplines. So other than "pay for services rendered," there are few extrinsic institutional rewards for faculty who teach such courses, especially in rigidly departmentalized colleges and graduate universities. In addition, freshman seminars are generally held to higher expectations with respect to outcomes than any other course in the college curriculum. Because of their reputation as a course type that improves student retention and academic success (Barefoot, 1992), the absence of such outcomes (or lack of research to demonstrate outcomes) may spell the demise of the course, even though other valuable outcomes may be realized.

In spite of these inherent difficulties, freshman seminars continue to flourish on numbers of American campuses. In addition to their demonstrated impact on student retention and improvement in grade point averages,

> faculty praise seminars for serving as a change of pace and for permitting more flexibility than regular courses. Many faculty use the course as a laboratory for experimenting with new instructional formats, and bring these new teaching methods back to their departmental classrooms. (Levine & Weingart, 1974, p. 30)

Linking Scholarship to Practice in the Freshman Seminar

The exponential growth of scholarship and research on student development has provided higher education professionals valuable information that can be used in designing courses and programs for students at all levels of the undergraduate experience. Because of its inherent flexibility, the freshman seminar is a useful structure within which to convert the special body of research on student success and retention into meaningful practice.

The three national surveys of freshman seminars have confirmed that the vast majority of freshman seminars are intentionally designed with one or more of the following research-based goals:

- ❒ Helping students achieve a felt sense of community
- ❒ Encouraging the involvement of students in the total life of the institution
- ❒ Academic and social integration of students

Community

Nevitt Sanford (1969) was one of the first higher education scholars to argue the importance of institutional "community" and to note its absence in the contemporary American college or university.

> It is fair to say that in most of our universities—and in many of our liberal arts colleges—a majority of the students suffer from a lack of a sense of community, confusion about values, a lack of intimate friends, a very tenuous sense of self (including serious doubt about their personal worth), and the absence of a great cause, movement, service, religion, belief system, or anything else that they might see as larger than themselves and in which they could become deeply involved (Sanford, 1988, p. 3).

In his classic, *Where Colleges Fail* (1969), Sanford argued that colleges fail whenever they treat students as less than whole persons and that learning depends on the whole personality, not merely intelligence. He maintained that institutions themselves lack "coherence." He foreshadowed the later research of Astin (1977) and Boyer (1987) by calling for the "involvement" of students themselves in campus life and involvement of faculty in the lives of the students.

Ernest Boyer (1987, 1990) also found that "new [college] students have little sense of being inducted into a community whose structure, privileges, and responsibilities have been evolving for almost a millennium"(1987, p. 43). The comprehensive research that Boyer and his colleagues reported in *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America* found that

> a successful freshman-year program will convince students that they are part of an intellectually vital, caring community, and the spirit of community will be sustained by a climate on the campus where personal relationships are prized, where integrity is the hallmark of discourse, and where people speak and listen carefully to each other. (1987, p. 57)

Involvement

Alexander Astin and Robert Pace are the best known of an array of higher education scholars who have researched and documented the positive correlation between student involvement and improved success/retention. Astin (1984) defines involvement accordingly:

> Quite simply, student involvement refers to the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience. Thus a highly involved student is one who, for example, devotes considerable energy to studying, spends much time on campus, participates actively in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty members and other students. (p. 297)

Both Astin (1984) and Pace (1984) found that highly involved students "who interact frequently with faculty" (Astin, 1977a, p. 223) are more satisfied with the college experience than those who do not. Astin (1977b) found further that

> virtually every significant effect on student persistence can be explained in terms of the involvement concept. Every positive factor is one that is likely to increase student involvement in the undergraduate experience, while every negative factor is one that is likely to reduce involvement. (p. 145)

Social and Academic Integration

The importance of student social and academic integration into college life has been the central message of Vincent Tinto's (1993) research on student retention. Using the work of Dutch anthropologist, Arnold Van Gennep (1960), as a framework, Tinto identified three stages in students' "rite of passage" into the first college year. The first stage, separation, is characterized by a decline in interactions with members of a former group. The second stage, transition, is a period during which the individual begins to interact with members of the new group. In this stage, persons learn the knowledge and skills necessary to function successfully in the new situation. The final stage, incorporation, may be marked by rituals or ceremonies which certify membership (Tinto, 1988). Tinto states that during the freshman year, students may feel a sense of normlessness. "Having given up the norms and beliefs of past associations and not yet having adopted those appropriate to membership in a new community, the individual is left in a state of at least temporary anomie" (1988, pp. 442-443).

Tinto (1988) found that student integration into the college experience is achieved primarily through interaction—with peers and with faculty. His findings parallel the more recent work of Astin (1993) who found that the greatest degree of positive student change in both cognitive and affective domains comes about on campuses in which there is a great deal of student-to-student and student-to-faculty interaction. Interaction between students themselves and between students and instructor is an explicit goal of many freshman seminars.

Tinto's views on the importance of academic and social integration have been validated by numbers of other campus-specific studies. One of the most significant is the report of a 17-year investigation of the freshman seminar (University 101) at the University of South Carolina. Fidler (1991) found that the positive significant relationship between participation in University 101 and freshman-to-sophomore retention was related to course "process"; that is, "University 101 participants are more likely than non-participants to achieve strong relationships with faculty . . . [and this] reflects greater social integration" (p. 34).

Tinto's recent research interests have focused on the learning community concept (Tinto & Goodsell, 1994). Learning communities (i. e., linked courses, cluster courses, blocked courses) link courses across the curriculum so that a single cohort of students enrolls in two or more courses together. The learning community concept enables a single group of students to share the same academic (and social) experience, therefore bringing together the related concepts of academic and social integration.

Whether freshman seminars have or have not been intentionally grounded in student development theory relates to when and why the seminars were begun. But with or without intent, common practice in many freshman seminars is consistent with theoretical constructs. Anecdotal evidence exists to indicate that when seminars depart from sound theory, their effectiveness, as measured by correlation with improved retention, grade point average, and overall student satisfaction, drops. Freshman seminars, in order to be most effective as tools for enhanced student success, need to be designed to bring about a sense of community, student involvement, and social interaction between all participants about academic topics and other issues of concern to students.

Conclusion

Frederick Rudolph (1977) stated that "the curriculum has been an arena in which the dimensions of American culture have been measured. It has been one of those places where we have told ourselves who we are. It is important territory" (p. 1). Throughout higher education's history, the changing curriculum has mirrored the changing needs and values of society. But the curriculum has also become the arena within which some of the fiercest and most interminable educational battles have been waged.

As a classroom structure with many specific and varied definitions, the freshman seminar represents a popular curriculum reform which has grown slowly but steadily, generally from the bottom up, with little in the way of accompanying fanfare. Campus by campus, institutions have chosen to employ the freshman seminar as a structured, intentional way to ease the transition into college life. This reform, like others before it, has seen its share of resistance from sincere educators who, like Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard (1990), believe that "there should be some limit as to how much effort an institution should expend on individual students"(p. 101). But in spite of such resistance, many American colleges and universities continue to redefine the limits of their responsibility to first-year students through the implementation of a freshman seminar.

Chapter Three

Survey Results and Analyses

For the 1994 National Survey, a questionnaire was mailed to all regionally accredited two- and four-year colleges and universities with a minimum student enrollment of 100. Data were collected to identify, compare, and contrast the various forms of freshman seminar programming in American higher education.

Description of Respondents by Key Variables

Of the 2,460 institutions surveyed in Fall 1994, responses were received from 1,003 for a response rate of 40.7%. The key variables in this research are (a) type of institution (two- or four-year); (b) level of enrollment; and (c) type of seminar. Table 1 presents the number and percentage of responding institutions by type of institution and level of enrollment. Table 2 presents the number and percentage of responding institutions with freshman seminars by seminar type. Of the 1,003 institutions responding to the survey, 720 or 71.8% reported that the campus offered at least one freshman seminar. This figure is up from 65.4% in 1991. Based upon similar results obtained for the 1991 survey, responding institutions are highly representative of American colleges and universities, as determined by computed z scores, with respect to institution type and level of enrollment.

Description of Freshman Seminars

The survey instrument asked a number of questions about the characteristics of freshman seminar courses with respect to goals, topics, a variety of structural features, instruction, administration, evaluation, longevity, and overall campus support. In most cases, data on a specific seminar characteristic are presented for all institutions, by type of institution, by

Table 1
Description of Seminar Respondents by Type of Institution and Level of Enrollment (N = 720)

Type Institution	Number	Percentage
Two-Year	229	31.8
Four-Year	491	68.2
Enrollment Level (*N = 695*)		
Under 1,000	157	22.6
1,001 - 5,000	349	50.2
5,001 - 10,000	90	13.0
over 10,000	99	14.2

Table 2
Description of Respondents by Type of Seminar (N = 720)

Type of Seminar	Number	Percentage
Extended Orientation	520	72.2
Academic (Common Content)	81	11.3
Academic (Variable Content)	56	7.8
Basic Study Skills	36	5.0
Professional*	9	1.3
Other*	18	2.5

*Not included in data analyses due to small numbers.

level of enrollment, and by type of freshman seminar. Chi-square analyses were performed to determine the significance of differences.

Seminar Goals and Topics *(For these variables, data analyses were not performed by type of institution or level of enrollment.)*

Course Goals - Across All Institutions

Survey respondents identified 24 discrete freshman seminar goals. Table 3 presents goals reported by at least 30 institutions in descending order of their frequency.

Course Goals - By Type of Seminar

Table 4 presents the eight most frequently reported goals for each seminar type. The primary goal for three seminar types, "develop academic skills" is implemented in a variety of ways depending upon entering students' academic abilities and desired course outcomes.

Topics - Across All Institutions

Table 5 presents topics reported by at least 40 institutions. Consistent with goals cited by respondents, "academic skills" is the most common topic for freshman seminars. The skills themselves vary from basic study skills to skills of abstract thinking and reasoning and conducting independent research. Skills taught in the first college year depend upon the academic abilities of entering students and institutional expectations for those students.

Topics - By Type of Seminar

Responding institutions reported a total of 24 topics which comprise the content of the freshman seminar. Table 6 presents the top 10 topics by seminar type in descending

Table 3
Course Goals Across All Institutions (N = 720)

Goal	Frequency
Develop academic skills	371
Provide orientation to campus resources & facilities	276
Ease transition/adjustment to college	256
Improve freshman-to-sophomore retention rate	105
Increase level of student/faculty interaction	82
Offer assistance with life skills/relationships/interpersonal skills	78
Develop analytical and critical thinking skills	76
Improve self-concept, self-assessment, and personal responsibility	75
Offer academic advising/planning/decision making; goal setting	74
Develop support groups; create friendships	71
Develop a sense of campus community; address campus issues	58
Improve communication skills (writing & oral presentation)	57
Introduce the liberal arts and/or the disciplines	56
Explore the purpose of higher education & institutional mission	53
Offer career planning	52
Provide an introduction to campus rules, regulations, policies, & procedures	35
Develop computer knowledge and experience	31

Note. This list includes only goals reported by at least 30 institutions. Percentages were not calculated because all 720 institutions with freshman seminars did not answer this question.

order of frequency for the three seminar types which have common content across sections.

Maximum Section Enrollment

Maximum Section Enrollment - Across All Institutions

Nearly three-fourths of institutions (73.3%) offering a freshman seminar set a maximum class size of 25 students or fewer. An additional 18.2% set the class size between 26-40 (Table 7).

Table 4
Course Goals by Type of Freshman Seminar in Descending Order of Frequency

Seminar Type			
Extended Orientation (N = 520)	Academic - Common Content (N = 81)	Academic - Variable Content (N = 56)	Basic Study Skills (N = 36)
Develop academic skills (280)	Develop academic skills (28)	Communication skills (23)	Develop academic skills (29)
Provide orientation to campus (239)	Develop analytical and critical thinking (24)	Develop analytical and critical thinking (22)	Ease transition to college (10)
Ease transition to college (218)	Introduce liberal arts/ disciplines (23)	Develop academic skills (20)	Provide orientation to campus resources (10)
Improve sophomore return rates (90)	Improve communication skills (20)	Increase student/ faculty interaction (18)	Improve self concept of students (6)
Develop life skills/ relationships (69)	Ease transition to college (16)	Introduce liberal arts/ disciplines (10)	Improve sophomore return rate (4)
Develop support groups (63)	Develop sense of community (15)	Offer academic advising and goal-setting(9)	Offer career planning (4)
Increase student/faculty interaction (54)	Provide orientation to campus resources (11)	Create common freshman experience (8)	Offer academic advising and goal setting (3)
Offer academic advising and goal setting (53)	Improve self-concept of students (10)	Ease transition to college(6)	Develop life skills/ relationships (3)

Note. For each seminar type, the table includes only the top eight of 23 reported goals. Percentages were not calculated because all responding institutions did not answer this question.

Table 5
Topics Across All Institutions (N = 720)

Topic	Frequency
Academic skills	359
Time management	236
Campus resources	149
Career exploration	129
Diversity issues	109
Wellness issues	108
Focus on self (exploration, assessment, concept, etc.)	97
Sexual and interpersonal relationships	86
Academic planning/advising	78
Library	65
Values clarification/decision making	62
College policies & procedures/plagiarism	61
Goal setting	59
Communication skills	59
Critical thinking	55
History and purpose of higher education/institution	47
Learning styles	43
Liberal arts & disciplines (connection)	43

Note. This table includes topics reported by at least 40 institutions. Percentages were not calculated because all institutions with freshman seminars did not answer this question.

Maximum Section Enrollment - By Type of Institution

Four-year institutions are more likely than two-year institutions to limit seminar section enrollments to 25 or fewer. Students taking the seminar at two-year campuses are more likely to experience class enrollments of over 25 (Table 8).

Table 6
Topics by Type of Seminar

Seminar Type		
Extended Orientation ($N = 520$)	Academic (Common Content) ($N = 81$)	Basic Study Skills ($N = 36$)
Academic skills (309)	Diversity issues (23)	Academic skills (25)
Time management (208)	Academic skills (16)	Time management (13)
Campus resources (134)	Values clarification (14)	Focus on self (6)
Career exploration (113)	Societal issues (13)	Goal setting (5)
Wellness issues (96)	Focus on self (12)	Campus resources (4)
Diversity issues (82)	Liberal arts & disciplines (12)	Career exploration (3)
Relationships (78)	Communication skills (9)	College policies (3)
Focus on self (74)	History & traditions (8)	Wellness issues (3)
Academic planning (67)	Career exploration (7)	Critical thinking (2)
Library (55)	Academic planning (6)	Library (1)

Note. This table lists the 10 most frequently reported topics for the three freshman seminar types with common content across sections. Percentages were not calculated because all respondents did not answer this question.

Table 7
Maximum Section Enrollment Across All Institutions (N = 650)

Maximum Section Enrollment	Number	Percentage
Fewer than 16 (< 16)	88	13.5
16 - 25	389	59.8
26 - 40	118	18.2
More than 40 (> 40)	55	8.5

Table 8
Maximum Section Enrollment by Type of Institution (N = 650)

	Section Enrollment			
Type Institution	<16	16-25	26-40	>40
Two-year	4.3%	55.5%	28.7%	11.5%
Four-year	17.9%	61.9%	13.2%	7.0%

$p < .001$

Maximum Section Enrollment - By Level of Enrollment

Smaller institutions (under 5,000 students) are more likely than larger colleges and universities to limit seminar enrollments to 15 or fewer students. Small institutions are just as likely as large campuses to offer seminars with class enrollments in excess of 40 (Table 9).

Table 9
Maximum Section Enrollment by Level of Institutional Enrollment (N = 627)

	Section Enrollment			
Institutional Enrollment	<16	16-25	26-40	>40
Under 1,000	16.1%	55.7%	16.1%	12.1%
1,001 - 5,000	16.1%	60.4%	16.4%	7.1%
5,001 - 10,000	8.3%	64.3%	19.1%	8.3%
Over 10,000	7.3%	60.4%	24.0%	8.3%

p = ns

Maximum Section Enrollment - By Type of Seminar

The most common maximum class enrollment for all seminar types was 16-25 students. However, basic study skills seminars are more likely than other seminar types to enroll over 25 students. Academic seminars in general are more likely to be restricted to small numbers of students (Table 10).

Method of Grading

Method of Grading - Across All Institutions

Slightly over three-fourths of institutions offering a freshman seminar provide a letter grade (75.4%). Since the 1991 National Survey, the percentage of institutions using the

Table 10
Maximum Section Enrollment by Type of Seminar (N = 650)

	Section Enrollment			
Seminar Type	<16	16-25	26-40	>40
Extended Orientation	11.9%	57.3%	21.2%	9.7%
Academic (common content)	19.2%	68.0%	10.3%	2.6%
Academic (variable content)	25.5%	72.7%	0.0%	1.8%
Basic Study Skills	3.3%	56.7%	26.7%	13.3%

$p < .001$

letter grade has increased from 68.1% to 75.4%. The remaining institutions provide pass/fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading.

Method of Grading - By Type of Institution

A majority of both two- and four-year institutions grade seminars with a letter grade (Table 11). Four-year institutions are more likely, however, to grade the seminar pass/fail.

Table 11
Method of Grading by Type of Institution (N = 682)

	Grading Method	
Type Institution	Pass/Fail	Letter Grade
Two-year	16.2%	83.8%
Four-year	28.7%	71.3%

$p < .001$

Method of Grading - By Level of Enrollment

Although a majority of institutions in each level of enrollment used letter grades, small institutions (under 1,000) and large institutions (over 10,000) are more likely to use pass/fail than medium-sized institutions (Table 12).

Table 12
Method of Grading by Level of Enrollment (N = 659)

	Grading Method	
Level of Enrollment	Pass/Fail	Letter Grade
Under 1,000	29.9%	70.1%
1,001 - 5,000	20.4%	79.6%
5,001 - 10,000	22.1%	77.9%
Over 10,000	32.7%	67.4%

$p < .05$

Method of Grading - By Type of Seminar

A clear majority of all freshman seminars, irrespective of type, are graded by a letter grade. However, the percentage of letter-graded courses is highest for the academic seminars. Table 13 shows that the extended orientation seminar is more likely than other types to be graded pass/fail--a fact probably related to the greater proportion of non-traditional content contained in such seminars (e.g., survival skills, orientation to services, etc.).

Table 13
Method of Grading by Type of Seminar (N = 682)

	Grading Method	
Seminar Type	Pass/Fail	Letter Grade
Extended orientation	28.2%	71.8%
Academic (common content)	13.0%	87.0%
Academic (variable content)	9.4%	90.6%
Basic study skills	25.0%	75.0%

$p < .01$

Freshman Seminar as a Required Course

Freshman Seminar as a Required Course - Across All Institutions

Slightly more than 4 institutions in 10 (42.8%) require all freshmen to take the freshman seminar. An additional 28.5% require some selected freshmen to take the course. Thus

over 70% of institutions require some or all freshmen to enroll in the freshman seminar. These percentages have changed little since the 1991 survey. Complete results are shown in Table 14.

Table 14
Freshman Seminar as a Required Course Across All Institutions (N = 715)

	Institutions Reporting	
Seminar Required for	Number	Percentage
All students	306	42.8
Some students	204	28.5
No students	205	28.7

Freshman Seminar as a Required Course - By Type of Institution

Four-year institutions are more likely than two-year institutions to require the seminar for all freshmen. Two-year campuses are somewhat more likely to require the course of some students or not require the course of any students (Table 15).

Table 15
Freshman Seminar as a Required Course by Type of Institution (N = 715)

	Seminar Required for		
Type Institution	All Students	Some Students	No Students
Two-year	26.8%	37.3%	36.0%
Four-year	50.3%	24.4%	25.3%

$p < .001$

Freshman Seminar as a Required Course - By Level of Enrollment

There is a clear relationship between size of a campus and the extent to which the seminar is required of freshmen. The larger the campus, the less likely it is to require the course. Over 70% of institutions with enrollments under 1,000 require students to take the freshman seminar, while over 50% of institutions over 10,000 do not require any freshmen to enroll (Table 16).

Freshman Seminar as a Required Course - By Type of Seminar

The freshman seminar type most often required for all students is the academic seminar with common content across all sections. This finding was expected since this seminar type

Table 16
Freshman Seminar as a Required Course by Level of Enrollment (N = 690)

	Seminar Required for		
Level of Enrollment	All Students	Some Students	No Students
Under 1,000	71.2%	21.8%	7.1%
1,001 - 5,000	45.4%	27.8%	26.9%
5,001 - 10,000	18.0%	36.0%	46.1%
Over 10,000	15.2%	32.3%	52.5%

$p < .001$

is often the centerpiece of a core curriculum. The seminar type most likely to be required for some students is the basic study skills seminar. Additional survey findings indicate that students required to take such a seminar are almost always those with acknowledged academic deficiencies (Table 17).

Table 17
Freshman Seminar as a Required Course by Type of Seminar (N = 715)

	Seminar Required of		
Seminar Type	All Students	Some Students	No Students
Extended orientation	39.5%	29.8%	30.8%
Academic (common content)	69.1%	13.6%	17.3%
Academic (variable content)	55.4%	10.7%	33.9%
Basic study skills	11.4%	68.6%	20.0%

$p < .001$

Linkage of Seminar to Other Courses

A question was added to the 1994 survey to determine the extent that campuses link or cluster the freshman seminar with other courses (i. e., a "learning community" approach). A total of 119 campuses or 17.2% of institutions with freshman seminars reported some effort to cluster the seminar with other courses. Although there are no significant differences by type of institution, level of enrollment, or type of seminar, orientation seminars are somewhat less likely to be part of a course cluster than other seminar types.

Academic Credit Applicable To Graduation

Academic Credit Applicable To Graduation - Across All Institutions

The vast majority of institutions (86.1%) allow freshman seminar credit to count towards graduation requirements. Table 18 presents the data.

Table 18
Academic Credit Applicable to Graduation Across All Institutions (N = 706)

	Institutions Reporting	
Academic Credit	Number	Percentage
Yes	608	86.1
No	98	13.9

Academic Credit Applicable To Graduation - By Type of Institution

Freshman seminars in large percentages of both two-year and four-year institutions carry academic credit towards graduation. These data are virtually identical with those reported in the 1991 survey (Table 19).

Table 19
Academic Credit Applicable to Graduation by Type of Institution (N = 706)

	Credit for Seminar	
Type Institution	Yes	No
Two-year	84.1	15.9
Four-year	87.1	12.9

p = ns

Academic Credit Applicable To Graduation - By Level of Enrollment

Table 20 shows how institutions award academic credit for the freshman seminar by enrollment level. Although there are no significant differences by enrollment levels, small institutions (under 1,000 enrolled) appear somewhat less likely to award credit.

Academic Credit Applicable To Graduation - By Type of Seminar

Although the overwhelming majority of all freshman seminars carry academic credit, basic study skills seminars (often designed as remedial courses) are less likely than other seminar

Table 20
Academic Credit Applicable to Graduation by Level of Enrollment (N = 681)

	Credit for Seminar	
Level of Enrollment	Yes	No
Under 1,000	81.8%	18.2%
1,001 - 5,000	85.9%	14.1%
5,001 - 10,000	84.1%	15.9%
Over 10,000	93.9%	6.1%

p = ns

types to count towards graduation. Nearly 40% of basic study skills seminars are offered for no credit (Table 21).

Table 21
Academic Credit Applicable to Graduation by Type of Seminar (N = 706)

	Credit for Seminar	
Seminar Type	Yes	No
Extended orientation	85.0%	15.0%
Academic (common content)	96.3%	3.8%
Academic (variable content)	98.1%	1.9%
Basic study skills	62.9%	37.1%

$p < .001$

Amount of Academic Credit

Amount of Credit - Across All Institutions

The typical freshman seminar today is offered for one semester or quarter hour of credit. Just over 50% of all seminars are offered on this basis. The three semester hour/quarter hour freshman seminar is the next most common (23.8%). A sizeable number of survey responses indicate that freshman seminars may comprise more contact ("clock") hours than is represented by the number of credit hours. For instance, freshman seminars carrying only one semester or quarter hour of credit may meet for two or more hours per week--the amount of contact time that normally equates to a three semester hour course. Table 22 reports the data on amount of credit from all respondents.

Table 22
Amount of Credit Across All Institutions (N = 618)

Amount of Credit Awarded	Institutions Reporting	
	Number	Percentage
1 semester/quarter hour	310	50.2
2 semester/quarter hours	98	15.9
3 semester/quarter hours	147	23.8
More than 3 semester/quarter hours	63	10.2

Amount of Credit - By Type of Institution

The one-semester/quarter hour credit model is the most frequently reported for both two-year and four-year institutions. Two-year campuses are more likely to offer the course for two or three hours credit while four-year campuses are more likely to offer the course for more than three semester/quarter hours credit (Table 23).

Table 23
Amount of Credit by Type of Institution (N = 618)

Type Institution	Amount of Credit Awarded			
	1 sem/qtr	2 sem/qtr	3 sem/qtr	>3 sem/qtr
Two-year	52.6%	19.9%	25.0%	2.6%
Four-year	49.1%	14.0%	23.2%	13.7%

$p < .001$

Amount of Credit - By Level of Enrollment

The one semester/quarter hour credit seminar is typical on campuses of all sizes. Three semester/quarter hour courses are somewhat more prevalent on campuses with over 5,000 students. Table 24 shows the results for all levels of enrollment.

Amount of Credit - By Type of Seminar

Over 50% of extended orientation seminars carry one semester/quarter hour of credit (Table 25). Academic seminars are more likely to carry three or more semester/quarter hours of credit. Actual findings for this question are consistent with those expected. As the level of freshman seminars moves on a continuum from remedial to advanced, and as

Table 24
Amount of Credit by Level of Enrollment (N = 595)

	Amount of Credit Awarded			
Enrollment	1 sem/qtr	2 sem/qtr	3 sem/qtr	>3 sem/qtr
Under 1,000	58.9%	11.6%	20.9%	8.5%
1,000 - 5,000	49.5%	13.4%	22.4%	14.7%
5,001 - 10,000	41.3%	21.3%	32.0%	5.3%
Over 10,000	45.7%	26.1%	25.0%	3.3%

$p < .01$

content moves from orientation to traditional academic content, numbers of credit hours carried by those courses increase.

Table 25
Amount of Credit by Type of Seminar (N = 618)

	Amount of Credit Awarded			
Seminar Type	1 sem/qtr	2 sem/qtr	3 sem/qtr	>3 sem/qtr
Extended orientation	59.9%	19.4%	18.7%	2.0%
Academic (common content)	20.8%	7.8%	36.4%	35.1%
Academic (variable content)	23.1%	3.9%	36.5%	36.5%
Basic study skills	34.8%	13.0%	34.8%	17.4%

$p < .001$

Application of Academic Credits

Application of Credits - Across All Institutions

Table 26 indicates survey findings on how freshman seminar credits are applied to various credit categories (i.e., core requirements, general education, major requirements, electives, and others). These findings are consistent with the most common role of the freshman seminar as an add-on course which does not "belong" to a specific discipline or major. Thus, nearly 50% of institutions apply credit as an elective. On nearly 19% of campuses, seminars are considered "core" courses, which indicates that they are required of all students and perceived to be central to the institution's curriculum. Seminar credits seldom meet major requirements.

Table 26
Application of Credits Across All Institutions (N = 610)

How Credits Applied	Institutions Reporting	
	Number	Percentage
Core requirements	115	18.9
General education	161	26.4
Elective	304	49.8
Major requirement	9	1.5
Other	21	3.4

Application of Credits - By Type of Institution

Both two- and four-year campuses apply credits for the seminar to the same credit categories. Four-year institutions are more likely to credit the seminar as a core requirement or general education requirement, while two-year institutions are more apt to count the course as an elective (Table 27).

Table 27
Application of Credits by Type of Institution (N = 610)

Type Institution	Credits Applied As				
	Core	General Ed	Elective	Major	Other
Two-year	12.7%	20.1%	62.4%	1.1%	3.7%
Four-year	21.6%	29.2%	44.2%	1.7%	3.3%

$p < .01$

Application of Credits - By Level of Enrollment

In general, a direct or inverse relationship exists between the three most typical application categories and level of enrollment. The elective credit model is more frequently used as campus size increases, while core and general education applications generally decrease in frequency as campus size increases (Table 28).

Application of Credits - By Type of Seminar

The clear majority of credit-bearing extended orientation and basic study skills seminars carry elective credit. Academic seminars are generally either part of a core requirement or

Table 28
Application of Credits by Level of Enrollment (N = 587)

Level of Enrollment	Credits Applied As				
	Core	General Ed	Elective	Major	Other
Under 1,000	27.9%	42.6%	25.6%	0.8%	3.1%
1,001 - 5,000	21.2%	28.1%	45.9%	0.7%	4.1%
5,001 - 10,000	6.7%	17.3%	69.3%	4.0%	2.7%
Over 10,000	8.8%	7.7%	79.1%	2.2%	2.2%

$p < .001$

carry general education credit. As noted above, few seminars of any type count toward requirements for the major (Table 29).

Table 29
Application of Credits by Type of Seminar (N = 610)

Seminar Type	Credits Applied As				
	Core	General Ed	Elective	Major	Other
Extended orientation	14.4%	23.1%	59.1%	0.7%	2.7%
Academic (common)	32.0%	40.0%	21.3%	1.3%	5.3%
Academic (variable)	33.3%	43.1%	17.7%	2.0%	3.9%
Basic study skills	12.5%	8.3%	70.8%	4.2%	4.2%

$p < .001$

Special Seminar Sections for Student Sub-Populations

Special Sections - Across All Institutions

According to Table 30, relatively small numbers of institutions provide special sections of the freshman seminar for various sub-populations of students. Special sections are offered most frequently for academically underprepared students (10.8%), adult students (7.9%), and honors students (7.9%).

Table 30
Special Sections Across All Institutions (N = 720)

	Institutions Reporting	
Student Sub-Population	Number	Percentage
Academically underprepared	78	10.8
Adults	57	7.9
Honors students	57	7.9
Other	50	6.9
Within same major	48	6.7
Athletes	28	3.9
Undecided as to major	26	3.6
Minority students	25	3.4
International students	20	2.8
Within particular residence hall	17	2.4
Commuting students	9	1.3
Incarcerated students	8	1.1
Women	7	1.0

Special Sections - By Type of Institution and Level of Enrollment

Because of the relatively small numbers of institutions offering special sections of the freshman seminar and the large number of sub-populations cited, many chi-square analyses were subject to small cell sizes. However, there is evidence that two-year institutions are more apt than four-year to offer sections for students with disabilities, international students, incarcerated students, and women. Four-year campuses are more likely to offer sections for honors, commuting, residence hall, and undecided students. Large institutions (over 10,000 students) are more likely to offer special seminar sections for international and residence hall students and students with disabilities.

Seminar Instruction

Teaching Responsibility - Across All Institutions

Across all colleges and universities, faculty are used most frequently to teach the freshman seminar (85.0%). Faculty are supplemented on one out of every two campuses by student

affairs professionals (54.2%) and by other campus administrators on every third campus (36.9%). Undergraduate and graduate students are used as freshman seminar instructors by fewer than one campus in ten (see Table 31). Since survey respondents were asked to indicate all instructor categories in use on their campus, the categories are not mutually exclusive. Responses in the "other" category include adjunct faculty, alumni, trustees, and private citizens.

Table 31
Teaching Responsibility Across All Institutions (N = 720)

	Institutions Reporting	
Teaching Responsibility	Number	Percentage
Faculty (F)	612	85.0
Student affairs professionals (SA)	390	54.2
Other campus administrators (CA)	266	36.9
Upper-level undergraduate students (UG)	62	8.6
Graduate students (G)	42	5.8
Other (O)	66	9.2

Teaching Responsibility - By Type of Institution

Four-year institutions are more likely than two-year institutions to use students to teach the seminar. There are no differences in the way faculty, student personnel professionals and other campus administrators are used to teach the seminar (Table 32).

Table 32
Teaching Responsibility by Type of Institution (N = 720)

	Teaching Responsibility					
Type Institution	F (n = 612)	SA (n = 390)	CA (n = 266)	UG** (n = 62)	G* (n = 42)	O (n = 66)
Two-year	84.7%	84.7%	35.4%	1.3%	1.8%	7.4%
Four-year	85.1%	85.1%	37.7%	12.0%	7.7%	10.0%

*$p < .01$ **$p < .001$

Teaching Responsibility - By Level of Enrollment

Very few differences exist in the utilization of instructor personnel by level of enrollment (Table 33). However, institutions with over 5,000 students enrolled are more likely to utilize graduate students as freshman seminar instructors. Presumably, larger institutions are more likely to offer graduate programs and have graduate students available for teaching or co-teaching responsibilities. Large institutions (over 10,000) are somewhat more likely to use student personnel professionals than were other sized institutions.

Table 33
Teaching Responsibility by Level of Enrollment (N = 695)

	Teaching Responsibility					
Enrollment Level	F (n = 590)	SA* (n = 378)	CA (n = 255)	UG (n = 61)	G** (n = 39)	O (n = 61)
Under 1,000	85.4%	52.9%	37.6%	8.3%	0.6%	7.0%
1,001 - 5,000	85.7%	51.0%	36.7%	8.9%	3.2%	7.5%
5,001 - 10,000	81.1%	56.7%	31.1%	6.7%	10.0%	12.2%
Over 10,000	84.9%	66.7%	40.4%	11.1%	18.2%	13.1%

*$p < .05$ **$p < .001$

Teaching Responsibility - By Type of Seminar

Faculty teach the clear majority of all types of freshman seminars. Table 34 shows that student affairs professionals, other campus administrators, undergraduate and graduate students are more likely to teach an extended orientation seminar than other seminar types.

Table 34
Teaching Responsibility by Type of Seminar (N = 720)

	Teaching Responsibility					
Type Seminar	F** (n = 612)	SA** (n = 390)	CA** (n = 266)	UG* (n = 62)	G (n = 42)	O (n = 66)
Extended orientation	81.7%	65.0%	42.9%	9.8%	6.0%	11.0%
Academic (common content)	97.5%	27.2%	28.4%	4.9%	3.7%	3.7%
Academic (variable content)	98.2%	16.1%	14.3%	3.6%	3.6%	1.8%
Basic study skills	83.3%	27.8%	19.4%	2.8%	8.3%	8.3%

*$p < .05$ **$p < .001$

In analyzing this survey finding, it is noteworthy that a wide variety of personnel from faculty, to students, to alumni are used to teach the seminar. Perhaps no other college course utilizes as wide a variety of instructors as the freshman seminar.

Role of Freshman Seminar Instructor as Academic Advisor

Role of Instructor as Academic Advisor - Across All Institutions

Respondents were asked to report if seminar instructors also serve as the academic advisor for students enrolled in the seminar. About one in three serve in this dual role (Table 35).

Table 35
Role of Instructor as Academic Advisor Across All Institutions (N = 696)

Instructor Serves as Advisor	Number	Percentage
Yes	233	33.5
No	463	66.5

Role of Instructor as Academic Advisor - By Type of Institution

Freshman seminar instructors in four-year institutions are more likely to advise their seminar students than are those in two-year colleges (Table 36). Although this question was changed slightly in this survey, the finding that instructors in four-year institutions are more likely to serve as advisors to their seminar students remained unchanged.

Table 36
Role of Instructor as Academic Advisor by Type of Institution (N = 696)

Type Institution	Advises Seminar Students	Does Not Advise Seminar Students
Two-year	27.6%	72.4%
Four-year	36.2%	63.8%

$p < .05$

Role of Instructor as Academic Advisor - By Level of Enrollment

Seminar instructors in institutions of modest size (5,001 - 10,000) are more likely to serve as the academic advisors for their seminar students. Instructors in large institutions are the least likely to serve in this dual role (Table 37).

Table 37
Role of Instructor as Academic Advisor by Level of Enrollment (N = 673)

Level of Enrollment	Advises Seminar Students	Does Not Advise Seminar Students
Under 1,000	38.2%	61.8%
1,001 - 5,000	32.1%	68.0%
5,001 - 10,000	43.0%	57.0%
Over 10,000	25.5%	74.5%

$p < .05$

Role of Instructor as Academic Advisor - By Type of Seminar

No significant differences were found in the extent to which seminar instructors advised seminar students by seminar type. Instructors in academic seminars with variable content are somewhat more likely to serve as advisors for seminar students (Table 38).

Table 38
Role of Instructor as Academic Advisor by Type of Seminar (N = 696)

Seminar Type	Advises Seminar Students	Does Not Advise Seminar Students
Extended orientation	32.3%	67.7%
Academic (common content)	36.3%	63.8%
Academic (variable content)	45.3%	54.7%
Basic study skills	23.5%	76.5%

p = ns

Freshman Seminar Instructor Training

Instructor Training - Across All Institutions

Nearly three institutions in four (70.8%) offer training for freshman seminar instructors, and 48.2% require training for those teaching the seminar (Table 39).

Instructor Training - By Type of Institution

No difference was found in the extent to which instructor training is offered by type of institution. About 70% of both types offer training for seminar instructors. Similarly, no

Table 39 -
Instructor Training Across All Institutions

	Institutions Reporting	
Instructor Training	Number	Percentage
Instructor training offered (N = 698)	494	70.8
Instructor training required (N = 689)	332	48.2

differences were found in the extent to which instructor training is required although about one in two four-year schools do require training (Table 40).

Table 40
Instructor Training by Type of Institution

	Instructor Training	
Type Institution	Offered (N = 698)	Required (N = 689)
Two-year	69.6%	43.6%
Four-year	71.3%	50.3%

p = ns

.

Instructor Training - By Level of Enrollment

A majority of institutions at all levels of enrollment offer training for seminar instructors. Institutions with enrollments under 1,000 are less likely than larger institutions to offer training (Table 41). Larger institutions (over 5,000) are more likely to require training.

Table 41
Instructor Training by Level of Enrollment

Level of Enrollment	Offered* (N = 673)	Required* (N = 665)
Under 1,000	53.6%	33.6%
1,001 - 5,000	70.8%	46.7%
5,000 - 10,000	87.5%	61.9%
Over 10,000	81.3%	61.9%

*$p < .001$

Instructor Training - By Type of Seminar

Table 42 shows that in a majority of all seminar types, training is offered for seminar instructors. Training is most commonly offered for instructors of academic seminars with common content (72.5%) and extended orientation seminars (72.5%). Likewise, training is most often required for instructors of academic seminars with common content (54.6%) and extended orientation seminars (50.2%). These findings are similar to those reported in the last survey conducted in 1991.

Table 42
Instructor Training by Type of Seminar

Type Seminar	Offered (N = 698)	Required* (N = 689)
Extended orientation	72.5%	50.2%
Academic (common content)	72.5%	54.6%
Academic (variable content)	61.1%	33.3%
Basic study skills	55.9%	35.3%

*$p < .05$

These findings indicate that as the content of a freshman seminar departs from a single discipline, the perceived necessity of instructor training increases. Academic seminars with common content are often interdisciplinary courses which focus on a single theme from a variety of perspectives. Such courses are generally designed by a faculty team, and anecdotal evidence indicates that faculty become involved in training designed to assist them in teaching an interdisciplinary course. Orientation seminars often address sensitive topics and campus issues about which faculty may have little prior knowledge. Finally, all instructors of freshman seminars in which attention to group process is a goal can likely benefit from extra help in methods of group facilitation.

Administrative Assignment of Seminar Teaching Load

Assignment of Seminar Teaching Load - Across All Institutions

Slightly more than half (53.2%) of institutions in which faculty teach the freshman seminar require faculty to teach the seminar as part of their regular teaching load. Slightly more than one in three of such institutions assign the course as an overload course for faculty. Similarly, but to a lesser extent, institutions use administrators or other administrative staff to teach the seminar as part of assigned duties or as an extra responsibility (Table 43).

Assignment of Seminar Teaching Load - By Type of Institution

Two-year institutions are more apt than four-year institutions to make freshman seminar instruction part of the regular teaching load for faculty or regular responsibility for staff

Table 43
Assignment of Seminar Teaching Loads Across All Institutions (N = 720)

	Institutions Reporting	
Teaching Load Assignment	Number	Percentage
Regular teaching load for faculty	383	53.2
Overload course for faculty	275	38.2
Assigned responsibility for administrative staff member	203	28.2
Extra responsibility for administrative staff member	212	29.4
Other	76	10.6

and administrators. The teaching of the seminar as part of a faculty member's regular load is the predominant practice followed at both two- and four-year institutions. Faculty overload is the second most frequently reported mode at both levels (Table 44).

Table 44
Assignment of Seminar Teaching Load by Type of Institution (N = 720)

	Teaching Load Assignment				
Type Inst.	Reg Fac Load*	Fac Overload	Reg Admin Load**	Extra Admin Load	Other
Two-year	64.2%	40.6%	33.2%	26.2%	10.0%
Four-year	48.1%	37.1%	25.9%	31.0%	10.8%

*$p < .001$ **$p < .05$

Assignment of Seminar Teaching Load - By Level of Enrollment

There were few differences among institutions by enrollment level. Larger institutions are more likely to assign seminar teaching to faculty on an overload basis. Approximately 50% of institutions with enrollment over 10,000 follow this practice. Small institutions (under 1,000) are more likely to assign seminar teaching as part of an administrator's regular load (Table 45).

Assignment of Seminar Teaching Load - By Type of Seminar

Except for extended orientation seminars, the majority of all seminars are taught as part of the faculty member's regular load. Extended orientation seminars are just as apt to assign

Table 45
Assignment of Seminar Teaching Load by Level of Enrollment (N = 695)

Level of Enrollment	Teaching Load Assignment				
	Reg Fac Load	Fac Overload*	Reg Admin Load*	Extra Admin Load	Other
Under 1,000	52.2%	30.6%	38.9%	26.1%	7.6%
1,001 - 5,000	55.9%	37.0%	24.9%	29.2%	9.5%
5,001 - 10,000	52.2%	46.7%	20.0%	30.0%	11.1%
Over 10,000	48.5%	50.5%	28.3%	34.3%	16.2%

*$p < .01$

seminar teaching as a faculty overload. Academic seminars rely less on administrators to teach the seminar than do other types (Table 46).

Table 46
Assignment of Seminar Teaching Load by Type of Seminar (N = 720)

Seminar Type	Teaching Load Assignment				
	Reg Fac Load* (n = 383)	Fac Overload** (n = 275)	Reg Adm Load* (n = 203)	Extra Adm Load* (n = 212)	Other (n = 76)
Extended orientation	45.0%	41.0%	33.3%	35.2%	11.7%
Academic (common content)	81.5%	40.7%	12.4%	18.5%	4.9%
Academic (variable content)	83.9%	26.8%	7.1%	7.1%	3.6%
Basic study skills	61.1%	25.0%	16.7%	22.2%	11.1%

*$p < .001$ **$p < .05$

Compensation For Teaching Freshman Seminar as an Overload or Extra Responsibility

Overload Compensation - Across All Institutions

The freshman seminar is taught as an overload or extra responsibility at 487 or 67.6% of reporting institutions. Of these, 338 or 72.8% report that financial or other compensation is offered for teaching the freshman seminar.

Overload Compensation - By Type of Institution

There is no difference between two- and four-year institutions in the degree to which they provide compensation for teaching the freshman seminar as an overload or extra responsibility. Approximately 70% of institutions of both types report that compensation is offered.

Overload Compensation - By Level of Enrollment

The majority of all colleges and universities offering the seminar compensate instructors for overload teaching. Mid-sized institutions (5,001 - 10,000) are most likely to compensate overload teaching (87.1%) while small campuses (less than 1,000) are least likely to do so (67.0%). Table 47 reports the findings.

Table 47
Overload Compensation by Level of Enrollment (N = 450)

Enrollment Level	Percentage Offering Compensation
Under 1,000	67.0
1,001 - 5,000	73.8
5,001 - 10,000	87.1
Over 10,000	68.1

$p < .05$

Overload Compensation - By Type of Seminar

There is no difference between seminar types in the degree to which the freshman seminar instructor is compensated for a course that is an overload or extra responsibility. Academic seminars with uniform content are somewhat more likely to award compensation.

Evaluation of Freshman Seminar Outcomes

Evaluation of Freshman Seminar Outcomes - Across All Institutions

The outcome measured most frequently by respondents is student satisfaction with course/instructor. Nearly half of all respondents use this measure. It is assumed that this outcome is measured by routine end-of-course evaluations. Other outcomes evaluated by at least 40% of respondents include persistence to sophomore year, student satisfaction with the institution, and use of campus services. The complete list of outcomes evaluated is shown in Table 48.

Table 48
Evaluation of Freshman Seminar Outcomes Across All Institutions (N = 720)

	Institutions Reporting	
Outcome Evaluated	Number	Percentage
Student satisfaction with course/instructor	353	49.0
Increased persistence to sophomore year	333	46.3
Student satisfaction with institution	320	44.4
Increased use of campus services	320	44.4
Improved academic skills or grade point average	282	39.2
Increase number of friendships among seminar classmates	278	38.6
Increased content knowledge	272	37.8
Increased out-of-class interaction with faculty	215	29.8
Increased level of student participation in campus activities	201	27.9
Increased levels of campus involvement	196	27.2
Increased persistence to graduation	178	24.7
Other	39	5.4

Evaluation of Freshman Seminar Outcomes - By Type of Institution

In a reversal from the 1991 survey, two-year institutions evaluate selected seminar outcomes more frequently than four-year institutions, (i.e., student satisfaction with the institution, use of campus services, improved academic skills or grade point average, and persistence to graduation). Student satisfaction with course/instructor, use of campus services, and student satisfaction with the institution are the outcomes evaluated most frequently on two-year campuses. Student satisfaction outcomes and persistence to the sophomore year are the most frequently evaluated outcomes on four-year campuses (Table 49).

Evaluation of Freshman Seminar Outcomes - By Level of Enrollment

There was only one significant difference found in the degree to which outcomes are formally evaluated by level of enrollment. Larger institutions (over 5,000) are more likely to evaluate student satisfaction with the course/instructor (Table 50).

Table 49
Evaluation of Freshman Seminar Outcomes by Type of Institution (N = 720)

Type Inst.	Satis. (Course)	Persist to Soph. Yr.	Satis.* (Inst.)	Use of** services	Improved** Acad. Skls.	Increased Friendships.	Content Knowl.	Faculty Interact.	Campus Activ.	Campus Involv.	Persist to* Grad.	Other
Two-yr.	54.2%	47.2%	49.8%	52.4%	47.6%	38.4%	42.4%	27.1%	28.4%	28.4%	30.1%	3.1%
Four-yr.	46.6%	45.8%	42.0%	40.7%	35.2%	38.7%	35.6%	31.2%	27.7%	26.7%	22.2%	6.5%

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$

Table 50
Evaluation of Freshman Seminar Outcomes by Level of Enrollment (N = 720)

Enroll. Level	Satis.* (Course)	Persist to Soph. Yr.	Satis. (Inst.)	Use of services	Improved Acad. Skls.	Increased Friendships.	Content Knowl.	Faculty Interact.	Campus Activ.	Campus Involv.	Persist to Grad.	Other
< 1,000	40.8%	46.5%	45.2%	44.0%	39.5%	39.5%	34.4%	31.2%	29.3%	31.9%	22.9%	4.5%
1,000-5,000	48.1%	49.0%	47.9%	47.0%	40.4%	41.3%	39.3%	32.1%	28.7%	28.1%	28.4%	4.6%
5,001-10,000	61.1%	41.1%	40.0%	46.7%	34.4%	32.2%	38.9%	27.8%	28.9%	21.1%	20.0%	3.3%
Over 10,000	52.5%	44.4%	37.4%	36.4%	38.4%	32.3%	38.4%	23.2%	22.2%	22.2%	19.2%	10.1%

*$p < .05$

Evaluation of Freshman Seminar Outcomes - By Type of Seminar

Significant differences were observed among types of seminars on eight outcomes. Basic study skills seminars evaluate the two persistence outcomes and improvement in academic skills most often. Use of campus services, campus involvement, and involvement in campus activities are evaluated the most often vis a vis extended orientation seminars. Evaluation of academic seminars focused most frequently on increased friendships and faculty interaction. No difference among seminar types was observed for content knowledge or the two student satisfaction outcomes (Table 51 on facing page).

Publication of Research Results

At one institution in five (19.0%) respondents reported they prepare written results of evaluation efforts. There were no significant differences by type of institution or type of seminar. However, the larger the institution, the more likely the preparation of a written report on freshman seminar outcomes.

Longevity of the Freshman Seminar

Longevity of the Freshman Seminar - Across All Institutions

Table 52 presents percentages of institutions reporting various lengths of time the freshman seminar has been offered. The responses range from 1 year or less (n = 94) to 112 years (n = 1). Responses indicate that the freshman seminar is a recent addition on many campuses. It is noteworthy that nearly one seminar in four was begun in the last two years. More than half are just five years old, and three in four were begun in the past nine years.

Table 52
Longevity of Freshman Seminars Across All Institutions (N = 683)

	Institutions Reporting	
Length of Time Offered	Number	Percentage
Less than 2 years	153	22.4
3 - 5 years	204	29.9
6 - 10 years	196	28.6
11 - 20 years	103	15.1
Over 20 years	27	3.5

Table 51
Evaluation of Freshman Seminar Outcomes by Type of Seminar (N = 720)

Seminar Type	Satis. (Course)	Persist to*** Soph. Yr.	Satis. (Inst.)	Use of*** services	Improved** Acad. Skls.	Increased** Friendships.	Content Knowl.	Faculty * Interact.	Campus** Activ.	Campus* Involv.	Persist to** Grad.	Other
Extended orientation	49.0%	49.4%	45.6%	51.0%	39.4%	39.8%	37.9%	28.1%	32.1%	30.6%	26.9%	4.4%
Academic (common content)	53.1%	38.3%	44.4%	29.6%	28.4%	49.4%	40.7%	38.3%	19.8%	24.7%	13.6%	4.9%
Academic (variable content)	42.9%	23.2%	37.5%	19.6%	35.7%	26.8%	33.9%	39.3%	14.3%	10.7%	12.5%	10.7%
Basic study skills	52.5%	63.9%	52.8%	41.7%	69.4%	38.9%	41.7%	36.1%	13.9%	22.2%	41.7%	8.3%

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

Longevity of the Freshman Seminar - By Type of Institution

No differences in longevity exist among two- and four-year institutions (Table 53). A majority of the freshman seminars in both two- and four-year institutions have been in existence for five years or less.

Table 53
Longevity of Freshman Seminar by Type of Institution (N = 683)

	Longevity (Years Offered)				
Type Institution	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 20	21+
Two-year	23.3%	30.5%	27.1%	14.3%	4.8%
Four-year	22.0%	29.6%	29.4%	15.4%	3.6%

p = ns

Longevity of the Freshman Seminar - By Level of Enrollment

No differences in freshman seminar longevity exist when institutions are examined by level of enrollment. However, Table 54 shows that seminars offered for six to ten years are somewhat more likely to be found on large campuses (over 10,000 students).

Table 54
Longevity of Freshman Seminar by Level of Enrollment (N = 663)

	Longevity (Years Offered)				
Level of Enrollment	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 20	21+
Under 1,000	25.3%	25.3%	28.1%	17.8%	3.4%
1,001 - 5,000	23.0%	32.2%	26.3%	14.0%	4.5%
5,001 - 10,000	18.6%	38.4%	26.8%	12.8%	3.5%
Over 10,000	21.9%	20.8%	37.5%	15.6%	4.2%

p = ns

Longevity of the Freshman Seminar - By Type of Seminar

As Table 55 indicates, there are no differences between seminar types in terms of longevity. Most seminars in all categories are products of the last ten years.

Table 55
Longevity of Freshman Seminar by Type of Seminar (N = 683)

	Longevity (Years Offered)				
Seminar Type	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 20	21+
Extended orientation	21.6%	30.7%	30.7%	13.4%	3.7%
Academic (common content)	25.0%	22.5%	30.0%	16.3%	6.3%
Academic (variable content)	24.1%	31.5%	13.0%	24.1%	7.4%
Basic study skills	25.0%	28.1%	18.8%	28.2%	0.0%

p = ns

Institutional Support For Freshman Seminars

Institutional Support - Across All Institutions

The final question on the survey sought the respondents' perception of the level of overall campus support from all constituents (students, faculty, staff, and administration). According to respondents, freshman seminars enjoy strong institutional support in American colleges and universities. Over 56% reported that support on their campus is high (top two rating categories on five-point scale) while only 11.3% described support as low (lowest two rating categories). Overall responses are shown in Table 56. These figures provide evidence of slightly lower support than reported in the 1991 survey when 64.9% reported that support was high and only 7.5% reported low campus support.

Table 56
Perceived Institutional Support Across All Institutions (N = 699)

	Institutions Reporting	
Rating of Support	Number	Percentage
1 - 2 (Low)	79	11.3
3 (Medium)	227	32.5
4 - 5 (High)	393	56.2

Institutional Support - By Type of Institution

Institutions do not differ by type in perceived support for the freshman seminar. There was a tendency for four-year campuses to report higher support (Table 57).

Table 57
Perceived Institutional Support by Type of Institution (N = 699)

	Rating of Support		
Type Institution	Low	Medium	High
Two-year	14.6%	31.4%	54.0%
Four-year	9.7%	33.0%	57.3%

p = ns

Institutional Support - By Level of Enrollment

A majority of respondents on campuses of all levels of enrollment (except 5,001 - 10,000) report high support for the seminar. The lowest support levels are reported on campuses larger than 5,000. Support for the seminar by level of enrollment is shown in Table 58.

Table 58
Perceived Institutional Support by Level of Enrollment (N = 699)

	Rating of Support		
Level of Enrollment	Low	Medium	High
Under 1,000	6.4%	33.3%	60.3%
1,001 - 5,000	10.7%	33.2%	56.1%
5,001 - 10,000	18.2%	35.2%	46.6%
Over 10,000	14.7%	23.2%	62.1%

$p < .05$

Institutional Support - By Type of Seminar

Table 59 provides a comparison by seminar type of the degree of overall institutional support for the freshman seminar. The highest levels of support are reported for academic seminars of either common or variable content although a majority or near majority of each type seminar report high support. Finally, it should be observed that responses to this item may be biased in either a positive or negative direction by the individual responder's personal perceptions.

Table 59
Perceived Institutional Support by Type of Seminar (N = 699)

	Rating of Support		
Seminar Type	Low	Medium	High
Extended orientation	12.6%	35.4%	52.0%
Academic (common content)	7.8%	19.5%	72.7%
Academic (variable content)	5.7%	22.6%	71.7%
Basic study skills	11.4%	40.0%	48.6%

$p < .001$

Summary

The following statements highlight the results of the third national survey of freshman seminars.

General Findings

- Over 70% of American campuses offer a freshman seminar.
- Freshman seminars have wide variety of course goals that vary from broad and encompassing to narrow and specific. The most popular goals are "develop academic skills," "provide orientation to campus resources and facilities," "ease the transition adjustment to college," and "improve freshman to sophomore retention rates."
- Similar to course goals, there is also wide variation in course topics across seminars. Those occurring most frequently are "basic study skills," "time management," "campus resources," "diversity," and "wellness" issues.
- Seminar classes are usually small. Nearly three-fourths of institutions limit class size to 25 students or fewer.
- Letter grades are the predominant grading pattern in freshman seminars. About three of four institutions assign letter grades and the remainder use pass/fail grading.
- About 43% of campuses require all freshmen to take the course. Over 70% require some or all students to complete a seminar.
- Credit for seminars is applicable to graduation on nearly 9 of 10 campuses. The typical seminar is offered for one semester/quarter hour credit and counts as elective credit (50%).

- Some campuses offer special sections of the seminar for students with special needs. The most frequently occurring sub-populations are academically underprepared students (10.8%) and adults and honors students (7.9%).

- Faculty are typically used to teach freshman seminars. They have instructional responsibility on more than 8 of 10 campuses which offer the course. Student affairs professionals, other administrators, and students supplement the teaching ranks.

- Instructors doubled as the students' academic advisors on about one-third of the campuses where seminars are offered.

- Instructor training is offered on 7 of 10 campuses for those teaching the course. Such training is required by 48% of campuses.

- Slightly more than half of campuses with seminars expect faculty to teach the course as part of their regular teaching load. However, nearly 40% require faculty to teach the course as an overload. About two thirds of campuses report that the seminar is taught on an overload or extra responsibility basis by faculty and/or administrators. About 7 out of 10 such campuses offer compensation.

- Seminars are being evaluated with increasing frequency on college campuses. Student satisfaction is the outcome evaluated most frequently as nearly every other campus reported its use. Other outcomes studied frequently include sophomore return rate, use of campus services, and satisfaction with institution. Respondents attribute these outcomes to the freshman seminar.

- About 80% of seminar programs were initiated during the past 10 years while almost 25% have been in existence for two years or less.

- Respondents report strong support for the seminar with about 90% rating support in the top three of five categories.

Analyses by Type of Institution

Four-year institutions are more likely than two-year institutions to limit section enrollment to 25 students or fewer.

A majority of both two- and four-year institutions grade seminars with a letter grade. Four-year colleges and universities are more likely, however, to grade on a pass/fail basis.

Four-year institutions are more apt than two-year colleges to require the seminar of all freshmen.

The one semester/quarter hour credit model is the most frequently reported for both two- and four-year institutions. Two-year campuses are more likely to offer the seminar for two or three semester/quarter hours credit while four-year campuses are more apt to assign more than three semester/quarter hours credit.

Four-year institutions are more likely to credit the seminar as a core or general education requirement, while two-year campuses are more apt to count the course as an elective.

Two-year institutions are more likely to offer special sections of the seminar for international students, incarcerated students, women students, and students with disabilities, while four-year campuses are more apt to offer sections for honors, commuting, residence hall, and undecided students.

Four-year institutions are more likely to use students to teach the seminar. Few other differences exist in teaching responsibility by type of institution.

Although instructors typically do not serve as academic advisors for their seminar students, instructors on four-year campuses are more likely than those on two-year campuses to serve in this role.

Although a majority of both two- and four-year institutions offer training for seminar instructors, there are no differences by institutional type.

Two-year institutions are more likely than four-year campuses to assign the seminar as part of the faculty member's regular teaching load or as part of a staff member's regular administrative load.

In a reversal from the 1991 survey, two-year institutions evaluate the following selected seminar outcomes more frequently than four-year institutions: student satisfaction with the institution, use of campus services, improved academic skills/grade point average, and persistence to graduation.

Analyses by Level of Enrollment

Although a majority of institutions at each level of enrollment use letter grades, small institutions (under 1,000) and large institutions (over 10,000) are more likely to use pass-fail grading than medium-sized institutions.

There is an inverse relationship between campus size and the likelihood the seminar will be required. The larger the campus, the less likely it is that the freshman seminar will be required.

One-semester/quarter hour of credit is the most common credit model on all size campuses. Three hour courses are somewhat more prevalent on campuses with over 5,000 students.

The elective credit model is more frequently used as campus size increases. Core and general education applications generally decrease in frequency as campus size increases.

Large institutions (over 10,000 students) are more likely to offer special seminar sections for athletes, international, residence hall, undecided, and minority students and for students with disabilities.

Institutions with over 5,000 students enrolled are more likely to use graduate students to teach freshman seminars. Institutions with over 10,000 students are somewhat more likely to use student personnel administrators to teach the seminar.

Seminar instructors in mid-sized institutions (5,001 - 10,000) are more likely to serve as the academic advisors for their seminar students. Instructors at large institutions are the least likely to serve in this dual role.

A majority of institutions at all levels of enrollment offer training for seminar instructors. However, small institutions (fewer than 1,000 students) are less likely to offer training than are larger ones. Larger institutions (over 5,000) are more likely to require training.

Larger institutions are more likely to assign seminar teaching to faculty on an overload basis while small institutions (under 1,000) are more likely to assign teaching as part of an administrator's regular load.

Mid-sized institutions (5,001 - 10,000) are most likely to compensate overload teaching while small campuses (under 1,000) are least likely.

A majority of respondents report strong support for the seminar. Weakest levels of support are found at institutions with enrollments of 5,001 - 10,000 students.

Analyses by Type of Seminar

Basic study skills seminars are more likely to enroll over 25 students per section. Academic seminars are most likely to be restricted to small sizes.

Extended orientation and basic study skills seminars are more likely than academic seminars to be graded pass-fail, although the majority of all seminar types assign letter grades.

Academic seminars with common content are most likely to be required of all students.

Credit for basic study skills seminars is also less likely than other types to apply towards graduation, although the vast majority of all seminar types grant credit which applies towards graduation.

Seminar types vary in the amount of credit granted. Extended orientation seminars typically grant one semester/quarter hour credit while academic seminars are more likely to offer three or more semester/quarter hours credit.

Most extended orientation and study skills seminars carry elective credit while academic seminars are more likely to count as part of core or general education requirements. Seminar courses rarely meet major or other requirements.

Although faculty teach the majority of seminars of all types, instructors of other types are more typically utilized in extended orientation seminars (i.e., student affairs professionals, other administrators, and students).

Although a majority of all seminar types offer related training for instructors, variation exists by type. Such training is most common for instructors of academic seminars with common content and extended orientation seminars. These two types are also more likely to require instructor training as a prerequisite for seminar teaching.

Except for extended orientation seminars, the majority of all seminars are taught as part of a faculty member's regular load. Extended orientation seminars are just as likely to assign seminar teaching as an overload. Academic seminars rely less on administrators to provide instruction than do other types.

Considerable variation by seminar type exists in the kinds of seminar evaluation conducted. Basic study skills seminars evaluate the two persistence outcomes most often as well as improvement in academic skills/grade point average. Use of campus services, campus involvement, and campus activities are evaluated most often on campuses with extended orientation seminars. Academic seminars are measured most frequently with respect to increased friendships and faculty interaction.

A high degree of institutional support is the most prevailing perception reported by respondents for each seminar type. However, the highest levels of support are reported for academic seminars.

Longitudinal Comparison of Survey Results

Table 60 reports the results of a comparison of certain variables across national surveys performed in 1988, 1991, and 1994. Many structural features of freshman seminars have stayed more or less the same over this period. The variables exhibiting the most change are "grade seminar with letter grade" and "offer seminar for one semester/quarter hour credit."

Table 60
Longitudinal Comparison of Survey Results

Percentage of Institutions Which	Survey Year 1988 (*N* = 1699)	1991 (*N* = 1064)	1994 (*N* = 1003)
Offer a freshman seminar	68.5%	65.4%	71.8%
Classify seminar type as			
Extended orientation	——	71.0%	72.2%
Academic (common content)	——	12.1%	11.3%
Academic (variable content)	——	7.0%	7.8%
Basic study skills	——	6.0%	5.0%
Other	——	3.8%	3.8%
Limit seminar size to 25 students	45.9%*	68.1%	59.8%
Grade seminar with letter grade	61.9%	68.1%	75.4%
Require seminar of all freshmen	43.5%	45.0%	42.8%
Offer academic credit for seminar	82.2%	85.6%	86.1%
Offer seminar for one semester/quarter hour credit	41.4%**	44.8%**	50.2%
Apply seminar credits as			
Core requirement	——	19.4%	18.9%
General Education	——	28.7%	26.4%
Elective	——	45.4%	49.8%
Major Requirement	——	2.4%	1.5%
Other	——	4.1%	3.4%
Provide seminar instruction using			
Faculty	——	84.5%	85.0%
Student Affairs Professionals	——	50.8%	54.2%
Other Campus Administrators	——	34.1%	36.9%
Undergraduate Students [4]	——	8.1%	8.6%
Graduate Students	——	4.2%	5.8%
Other	——	10.2%	9.2%

Key: —— Question not on survey or not posed in same manner
* Seminar limited to fewer than 20 students
** 1 semester hour only

	Survey Year		
	1988 (*N* = 1699)	1991 (*N* = 1064)	1994 (*N* = 1003)
Use seminar instructors to advise their seminar students	——	——	33.5%
Offer training for instructors	——	71.4%	70.8%
Require training for instructors	——	46.7%	48.2%
Assign teaching of seminar as:			
Regular load for faculty	——	51.9%	53.2%
Overload for faculty	——	36.5%	38.2%
Regular load for administrators	——	25.2%	28.2%
Extra responsibility for administrators	——	31.7%	29.4%
Assign seminar teaching as overload or extra responsibility	——	63.0%	67.6%
Evaluate following seminar outcomes:			
Student satisfaction with course/instructor	——	66.6%	49.0%
Persistence to sophomore year	——	43.2%	46.3%
Provide written or published reports of evaluation	11.1%	——	19.0%
Report program longevity as			
2 years or less	30.1%	23.8%	22.4%
5 years or less	64.6%	59.5%	52.3%
10 years or less	——	81.4%	80.9%
Report institutional support as:			
High	——	64.9%	56.2%
Low	——	7.5%	11.3%
Report following goals for seminar (rank order)			
Develop essential academic skills	——	(1)	(1)
Provide orientation to campus	——	(2)	(2)
Ease transition to campus	——	(3)	(3)

Key: —— Question not on survey

CHAPTER FOUR

QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

Although it is valuable to study and analyze the common characteristics of freshman seminars in American colleges and universities, some of the most interesting information about these courses emerges from an in-depth look at specific seminars. Up to this point, this monograph has reduced the freshman seminar to its various structural elements and has compared these elements quantitatively. The purpose of this chapter is to present a qualitative analysis of exemplary freshman seminars in each category as well as a short description of other seminars with one or more unique characteristics.

The Extended Orientation Seminar: Longwood College

Longwood College is a public institution of moderate selectivity located in Farmville, Virginia. Longwood enrolls approximately 3,000 students, 680 of which are freshmen. The eight-year-old Longwood freshman seminar (LSEM 100) is a one-credit hour course required of all entering first-year students (including first-year transfers who have not taken a similar course at another institution). The pass/fail course is described as "an introduction to the goals of a college education, the skills and knowledge needed for college involvement and success, and the programs and facilities of the college."

Section size is limited to 25 students, and the course is taught by faculty, student affairs professionals, academic administrators, and upper-level students (as helpers). Instructors serve as academic advisors for students in their seminar sections. Seminar instructors are paid on an overload basis and must participate in a three-day training workshop. The course meets for a total of 22 clock hours spread over the first 11 weeks of the 14-week semester.

During this 11-week period, the course addresses a variety of topics arranged thematically into seven units:

1. Making the Transition
2. Achieving Academic Success
3. Managing Life Outside of Class
4. Getting to Graduation and Beyond
5. Managing Yourself and Others
6. Exploring Resources
7. Outside-of-Class Trips

The Longwood freshman seminar parallels other extended orientation seminars with respect to overall goals, content, number of credit hours, and instruction. However, this course is unique in that it is graded pass/fail: The majority of freshman seminars of all types are letter-graded. The seminar is also noteworthy because it is designed to accomplish a reasonable and manageable number of objectives. Many seminars, irrespective of

credit or contact hours, attempt to address more discrete topics than can reasonably be covered in a limited number of contact hours. For more information contact Frances N. Hamlett, Co-Director.

The Academic Seminar with Common Content Across Sections: Union College

Union College is a selective, private, liberal arts college in Schenectady, New York enrolling 2,000 students, 535 of whom are freshmen. Since 1977, the cornerstone of the educational program at Union has been the Freshman Preceptorial, a 10-week, writing-intensive, "great books" course, required of all freshmen, taught in sections of 15 by faculty from many departments and from each division—Humanities and Social Sciences, Science and Engineering. The stated goals of this course are to provide a common background for all students, to improve their reading, writing, and speaking skills, and to give them a cross-cultural experience. The Preceptorial is a letter-graded course and is considered a core curriculum requirement. Teaching in this program is part of faculty members' regular teaching load, but preceptors are also given extra pay for research and travel.

In 1994, the college convened a group of faculty and students to assess the effectiveness of the Preceptorial, and as a result of that assessment, a number of changes were made including changes to the reading list itself. It was determined that readings should be selected that (a) are believed by faculty and students to be enjoyable, (b) are thought-provoking and stimulate class discussion, (c) are well-written, and (d) expose students to a variety of cultural perspectives. The readings themselves have been divided into five "packets" of related texts with an explicit theme. The packets and their related readings are as follows:

1. Predicaments of Action and Judgment

   The Mahabarata (film), Peter Brook
   The Bhagavad-Gita
   Hamlet, Shakespeare
   "Hamlet in the Bush" - Laura Bohannan
   "Testing One's Sword" - Mary Midgely

2. The Nature of Wisdom

   The Last Days of Socrates, Plato
   The Way, Lao Tzu
   Selections from *Moments of Being and Non-Being*, Virginia Woolf

3. Belief and Unbelief

   The Bible, Genesis and Chapters from the Book of Mark
   The Koran, Selections about the Patriarchs and the Prophet Jesus
   Candide, Voltaire
   Future of an Illusion, Freud

4. A Genealogy of Freedom

"On Money," "On Primitive Accumulation," "On the Genesis of an Industrial Capitalist," Karl Marx
The Life of Olaudah Equiano
"Letter to His Old Master," "What to a Slave is the Fourth of July?" Frederic Douglass
"Ain't I a Woman," Sojourner Truth
Beloved, Toni Morrison

5. Living with Consequences

Selections from *One Earth, One Future: Our Changing Global Environment*, National Academy of Sciences
"The Tragedy of the Commons," Daniel McKinley
An Enemy of the People, Henrik Ibsen
"In Defense of Whistle Blowing," Gene G. Jones; and "Ten Whistleblowers and How They Fared," Myron Glazer, from *Ethical Issues in Professional Life*

Preceptors may choose an alternate packet, Choosing to Live, Choosing to Die, which includes:

"Death and Dignity: A Case of Individualized Decision-Making," from the *New England Journal of Medicine*
Death of Ivan Illyich, Tolstoy
"On Observing the Death of Another," "To Philosophize is to Learn to Die," Montaigne

Preceptors are experimenting with ways of using cooperative learning in the Freshman Preceptorial, and as a group, preceptors meet for weekly lunches which combine teacher training and interdisciplinary conversation. During the weekly lunch, faculty teams (including experienced and novice preceptors) offer presentations on one of the packets which include discussion strategies, a bibliography of relevant library sources, possible test questions, and paper topics.

The Union College Preceptorial shares with other seminar programs of its type an emphasis on a common experience for all participants. This course is unique, however, in that it addresses several themes rather than one theme, and that faculty preceptors are given a monetary bonus for participating in this demanding program. Finally, the written assessment report submitted with the survey response represents a sincere, systematic institutional effort to improve the course and its relevance to students and teaching faculty. For more information, contact Margaret Schadler, Associate Dean.

Academic Seminars on Various Topics: Carleton College

Carleton College is a private, selective, liberal arts college in Northfield, Minnesota. Carleton enrolls 1,765 students; 528 are freshmen. Carleton offers a selection of "Special Courses for

New Students" which include Seminars, History 110 Sections, Integrated General Studies Courses, and Writing Seminars. Seminars for First-Year Students and Writing Seminars must be taken on a Satisfactory/Credit/No Credit basis (called SCRUNCH at Carleton).

All special courses are distinctive because (a) they have limited enrollments, (b) they are designed specifically for first-year students, (c) they emphasize class discussion, and (d) whenever possible course instructors serve as academic advisors to students in their classes. Overall course goals are to provide an introduction to the liberal arts, to encourage critical thinking, and to provide maximum opportunity for individual participation. Special courses are offered all three terms, and students may select more than one during their first year, but only one per term. Students receive a list of available special courses in the spring of their admission and are invited to select their top four choices. Seminar topics include the following:

- Gender Issues in Sport
- Freedom of Speech
- Cosmology: A Beginner's Guide to the Universe
- From Homer to Hobbits
- Medieval Visions, Modern Versions
- Spirit of Place
- Our World in Other Words: Family, Race, Class, Gender
- Searching for Utopia
- Theater: From Script to Stage
- Men and Women: Real and Imaginary
- Learning to Curse
- The Image in the Mirror: Searching for Self
- Time in Contemporary Music
- Zeno's Paradoxes
- Dostoevsky and His Times
- Chemistry, Color, and Art
- The World as Theater, Life as a Play
- Journeys Toward Spiritual Growth

Each seminar carries six credits of the 210 credits required for graduation. Each seminar comprises 10 weeks and approximately 33 actual contact hours. Instructors meet before the semester to share concerns, but no "instructor training" is offered or required. One potential future change in the seminar structure will be the clustering of courses with three faculty members working together to design the cluster.

Carleton's well-developed seminar program is representative of others of its type. It is somewhat unique in that grading is by the SCRUNCH system. For more information, contact Elizabeth J. Ciner, Associate Dean of the College.

Professional Seminar: Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania

The Wharton School, considered by many to be the most prestigious undergraduate business school in the world, requires new students to participate in a non-credit seminar,

Wharton 101: Leadership and Communication in Groups. This semester-long course comprises 33 contact hours and is a requirement for graduation. The goals of Wharton 101 include enhancing students' abilities to work in groups and easing the transition into the Wharton, University, and Philadelphia communities. Classes are taught by tenured faculty. In 1994, eight cohorts of 60 students were formed corresponding to eight lecture sections. Lecture sections are designed to fit a variety of student interests and are the following:

1. Homelessness
2. Several Options*
3. Environment
4. Several Options*
5. Health
6. Elderly
7. Kids
8. Several Options*

(*These lecture sections address various topics.)

Lecture sections are further divided into five teams of 12 students, each team comprising a recitation section. In recitations, students come together for intensive classes in which video is used and in which students manage a two-month project that provides service and support to the community.

Classes are divided into four content modules: self-awareness, project management, interpersonal relations and group dynamics. The teaching method is reported to be interactive and experiential. The program culminates in a conference in which students present their learnings and accomplishments.

Professional or discipline-based seminars represent a current trend in freshman seminar programming. Widely used in colleges of engineering and other professional schools that enroll first-year students (nursing, agriculture, etc.), these seminars attempt to introduce students to the college or university as a whole, but also to the department, school, or college and to the related demands of the discipline and profession. As is the case with Wharton 101, faculty within the discipline generally are seminar instructors. For more information, contact Patricia A. Schindler, Assistant Director, External Relations.

Basic Study Skills Seminar: Santa Fe Community College

Santa Fe Community College in Santa Fe, New Mexico enrolls approximately 4,900 students, both full- and part-time, of which 1000 are first-year students. Santa Fe offers academic assistance to entering students in a variety of formats. Students whose reading is determined to be at the eighth to tenth grade level are required to take a three semester hour seminar which has as its goals (a) acquisition of very basic study skills such as improved reading and writing, (b) students' self-knowledge and enhanced self-concept, and (c) library use—specifically understanding how to begin and move through a library research project. Academic credit for this course is awarded by some departments at the

discretion of the department head. As the culminating activity for the course, students must give a 10-minute oral presentation. For many students, this is their first experience in speaking before a group. Reading instruction includes portfolio development—a collection of student work that demonstrates their achievement of the various related reading skills. Writing exercises include a "Letter to a Friend," a two-page letter to a real or imaginary friend describing recent activities, what factors led to the decision to return to college, and future goals and plans, and "Important Learning Experiences"which are stories about two or three important learning situations in or out of class.

Course directors indicate that not only do seminar students require assistance with academic skills such as reading and writing, but they also have different affective needs. As a group, they have a fragile self-concept; many have had negative experiences in other educational settings and require a great deal of emotional support and affirmation. For more information, contact Shuli Lamden, Reading and Learning Specialist.

Other Seminars with Unique Characteristics

North Adams State University. A Two-Tiered, Theme-Based Seminar

North Adams State in North Adams, Massachusetts offers a seminar with the overall theme, "Trading Eyes: Exploring Alternative Visions." Fourteen seminar sections are divided into 4 clusters, each with its own sub-theme. One of these is "The Environment."

Suffolk University. A Summer Seminar

Suffolk University in Boston, Massachusetts offers a non-credit freshman seminar for three weeks during the summer before the first semester.

Roxbury Community College. Seminars in Other Languages.

Roxbury Community College in Massachusetts offers language-specific sections of the freshman seminar in Russian, French, and Spanish as well as English.

Wheelock College. An Extended Seminar

Wheelock College in Boston, Massachusetts involves students in micro-ethnographies of campus organizations during the freshman seminar which extends over one and a half semesters.

SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry. Shared Seminar Ownership

SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry in Syracuse has implemented a "compound" seminar: Six sessions covering topics for all students are taught by the vice president for student affairs; eight sessions for students grouped by major are taught by their respective program faculty.

Cornell University. Writing Seminars

Cornell University in Ithaca, New York offers various freshman seminars, among them writing seminars with at least eight and no more than 14 formal writing assignments, opportunities for rewriting, and classroom time spent on writing. These seminars are offered in more than 170 sections in more than 30 departments and programs.

Davidson College. Merging Freshman Seminar Content in Other Courses

Davidson College in North Carolina includes transition content in its required physical education course, PED 101. Sexuality, alcohol, and drug issues are included with instruction in CPR and swimming.

Clarke College. Internet Seminar Pen-Pals

Seminar students at Clarke College in Dubuque, Iowa interact with other seminar classes at other colleges via e-mail on the Internet.

College of St. Catherine. Linking Freshman and Senior Seminars

The College of St. Catherine in St. Paul, Minnesota links the freshman seminar, "The Reflective Woman," with a senior capstone course, "The Global Search for Justice."

Hastings College. A Seminar Choice for Everyone

Hastings College in Nebraska offers three versions of the freshman seminar: one for almost all students, one for the 20 or so best first-year students, and one for the 30 or so worst students in terms of their academic qualifications.

University of California at Los Angeles. Thorough assessment

The University of California at Los Angeles has conducted a lengthy, in-depth qualitative and quantitative analysis of the effect of the freshman seminar on both student satisfaction with university life and retention.

These seminars offer an indication of the many ways in which freshman seminars can be utilized depending upon the mission, character, and expectations of a particular campus and the needs of the entering students. In spite of dramatic differences, all the referenced seminars share the common goal of facilitating some aspect of the academic or social integration of students into the college or university environment.

EPILOGUE

As we reflect on this and previous years' survey data, we wish to offer our collective observations and continuing questions with respect to this interesting collection of courses known by the title "freshman seminar." With inherent flexibility, these courses continue to flourish on campuses throughout American higher education. But given the freshman seminar's frequent position as an add-on to the traditional curriculum, battles are continually waged about whether seminars are "real courses," whether they merit academic credit, and how they will be funded. We and our colleagues in the National Resource Center have observed that "successful" seminars—those that enjoy strong broad-based institutional support and long life—are those that exhibit some or all of the following characteristics:

- ❒ They carry academic credit.
- ❒ They are centered in, rather than tangential to, the first-year curriculum serving as part of general education, core, or major requirements.
- ❒ They include academic content—often extra- or interdisciplinary content that is woven into essential process elements such as study skills, library use, writing, etc.
- ❒ Faculty are involved in all stages of program design and instruction.
- ❒ Student affairs professionals are also involved in all stages of program design and instruction.
- ❒ Instructors are trained in basic methods of group facilitation and active learning pedagogies: Course "process" becomes as important as course "content."
- ❒ Instructors are paid or otherwise rewarded for teaching the seminar.
- ❒ Upper-level students are involved as peer leaders or co-facilitators.
- ❒ Courses are evaluated on a regular basis, and results of this evaluation are made available to the entire campus community.

Although we have been successful in determining seminar characteristics that correlate with support and longevity, we have many continuing questions about the seminars that die untimely deaths—what factors, logical or otherwise, might explain the "failure to thrive" of certain freshman seminar programs.

In addition, we continue to be interested in transition seminars for other types of students in transition—specifically transfer students and seniors. We have taken an initial step to determine the numbers of existing transfer seminars; our preliminary research indicates that few such programs exist in American higher education (< 75), but the

interest in transfer seminars is increasing as campuses become more aware of and dependent upon these students and their unique needs.

We wish to thank all who responded to the 1994 National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming. We look forward to continuing dialogue about the many innovations that characterize the freshman seminar in American higher education.

APPENDIX A

1994 National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming
National Resource Center for the Freshman Year Experience
University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208

1. Name of Institution _____

2. City_____ 3. State____ 4. Zip Code_____

Your Name _____ Title _____

5. What is the approximate undergraduate enrollment at your institution?_____

6. What is the approximate size of the freshman class at your institution? _____

7. Does your institution (including any department or division) offer one or more freshman seminar-type courses? _____yes, _____no

(If **yes,** please attach a current sample syllabus or course description with returned survey.)

8. If **no,** do you plan to offer such a course in the next academic year (1995-96)? __yes __no

IF YOUR INSTITUTION DOES NOT CURRENTLY OFFER A FRESHMAN SEMINAR-TYPE COURSE, PLEASE DISREGARD REMAINING QUESTIONS, AND RETURN SURVEY IN THE ATTACHED ENVELOPE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR RESPONSE.

* * * * *

IF YOUR INSTITUTION CURRENTLY OFFERS A FRESHMAN SEMINAR-TYPE COURSE, PLEASE COMPLETE THE REMAINING SURVEY QUESTIONS.

9. Check each discrete type of freshman seminar (a, b, c, d, e, or f) that exists on your campus.

a. ___**Extended orientation seminar.** Sometimes called freshman orientation, college survival, or student success course. May be taught by faculty, administrators, and/or student affairs professionals. Content will likely include introduction to campus resources, time management, study skills, career planning, cultural diversity, student development issues.

b. ___**Academic seminar with generally uniform academic content across sections.** May either be an elective or a required course, sometimes interdisciplinary or theme oriented, sometimes part of a required general education core. Will often include academic skills components such as critical thinking and expository writing.

c. ___**Academic seminars on various topics.** Specific topics are chosen by faculty who teach sections. Will generally be elective courses. Topics may evolve from any discipline or may include societal issues such as biological and chemical warfare, urban culture, animal research, tropical rain forests, the AIDS epidemic.

d. ___**Professional seminar.** Generally taught within professional schools or specific disciplines such as engineering, health sciences, or education to prepare students for the demands of the major and the profession.

e. ___**Basic study skills seminar.** Generally offered for academically underprepared students. Will focus on such basic skills such as grammar, note-taking, and reading texts, etc.

f. ___**Other** (Please describe in detail) _____

_____

_____

_____

Please note:

IF YOU HAVE CHECKED MORE THAN ONE FRESHMAN SEMINAR TYPE, SELECT THE SEMINAR (a, b, c, d, e, or f) WITH THE HIGHEST TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND ANSWER SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR <u>THAT SEMINAR ONLY</u>.

10. I am answering remaining questions for seminar ___a, ___b, ___c, ___d, ___e, ___f

11. In your opinion, what are three primary goals of your freshman seminar program?

_____
_____
_____

12. If your seminar has a <u>common curriculum across sections</u>, what, in your opinion, are the most important topics that comprise the content of the freshman seminar? (List up to 5 topics.)

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____

13. Please identify titles and authors of up to 3 books used as texts in the freshman seminar.

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

14. Please provide titles of other reading materials that are currently required either prior to (i.e., summer readings) or during the freshman seminar.

_____ _____
_____ _____

15. Please list up to six primary instructional activities employed in the freshman seminar (for example: lecture, group discussion).

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

16. What is the total enrollment for the freshman seminar program (all class sections)? ____

17. What is the maximum number of students allowed to enroll in each freshman seminar section? ____

18. Who teaches the freshman seminar? (Check all that apply.)

a. _____ Faculty
b. _____ Student affairs professionals
c. _____ Other campus administrators
d. _____ Upper-level undergraduate students
e. _____ Graduate students
f. _____ Other (please identify)_____

19. Do freshman seminar instructors serve as academic advisors for students in their seminar sections?
___yes ___ no

20. How is the freshman seminar graded? ____pass/fail, ____letter grade

21. What college, school, department, or unit administers the freshman seminar? _____

22. Based on **formal, systematic evaluation of the freshman seminar**, which, if any, of the following outcomes are the result of the freshman seminar? Check all that apply.

a. _____ increased content knowledge
b. _____ student satisfaction with course/instructor
c. _____ student satisfaction with the institution
d. _____ increased persistence to sophomore year
e. _____ increased persistence to graduation
f. _____ improved academic skills or grade point average
g. _____ increased use of campus services
h. _____ increased level of student participation in campus activities
i. _____ increased out-of-class interaction with faculty
j. _____ increased number of friendships among freshman seminar classmates
k. _____ increased levels of campus involvement
l. _____ other (please describe) _____

23. Have you prepared a written report of your research results? ___ yes, ___ no
(If yes, please enclose this report with the survey.)

24. Administratively, how is the freshman seminar configured for workload and compensation?
(Check all that apply.)

a. _____ as part of a faculty member's regular teaching load
b. _____ as an overload course for faculty
c. _____ as one of the assigned responsibilities for administrator/staff instructors
d. _____ as an extra responsibility for administrator/staff seminar instructors
e. _____ other (please describe) _____

25. If taught as an overload or extra responsibility, is financial or other compensation offered for teaching a freshman seminar? _____yes, _____no

26. Is instructor training offered for freshman seminar instructors? ___ yes, ___no

27. Is instructor training required for freshman seminar instructors? ___yes, ___no

28. If instructor training is offered, over what length of time does it occur?_____
(e. g., one day, two days, five days, etc.)

29. How long has the freshman seminar been offered on your campus? _____ years

30. What freshmen are required to take the freshman seminar? ___all, ___some, ___ none.

31. If you answered "some" to the previous question, which freshmen (by category) are required to take the freshman seminar?

a. ___ Academically underprepared students
b. ___ Athletes
c. ___ Undecided students
d. ___ Students in specific majors
e. ___ Minority students
f. ___ Students in particular residence hall
g. ___ Honors students
h. ___ Other _____

32. Are different sections of the freshman seminar offered for any of the following unique sub-populations of students? Check all that apply.

a. ___ Adults
b. ___ Minority students
c. ___ Commuting students
d. ___ Athletes
e. ___ Handicapped students
f. ___ International students
g. ___ Students residing within a particular residence hall
h. ___ Women
i. ___ Academically underprepared students
j. ___ Students within a specific major
k. ___ Honors students
l. ___ Undecided students
m. ___ Incarcerated students
n. ___ Other, please identify _____

33. How many total classroom contact hours (clock hours), per student, comprise the entire freshman seminar course? _____

34. Over what length of time is the freshman seminar offered? _____
(example: six weeks, one semester)

35. Does the freshman seminar carry academic credit towards graduation? __yes, __no

36. If yes, how many semester/quarter hours or other credits does the freshman seminar carry?

a. ___ one
b. ___ two
c. ___ three
d. ___ more than three

37. If the freshman seminar carries academic credit, how does such credit apply?

a. ___ toward core requirements
b. ___ toward general education requirements
c. ___ as an elective
d. ___ toward major requirements
e. ___ other (please describe) _____

38. Is the freshman seminar linked to, clustered, or paired with other courses (i.e., a "learning community" approach)? ___yes ___ no

39. On a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high), what do you believe to be the level of overall campus support (from students, faculty, staff, administration) for the freshman seminar?
(low)___1___ 2___ 3___4___5(high)

40. What changes, if any, are anticipated in the freshman seminar structure, administration, organization, or content in the near future? _____

Thank you for your response. A written report of the results will be available in Spring, 1995. For more information, call or write The National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience, 1728 College Street, Columbia, SC 29208. Phone: 803-777-6029, FAX: 803-777-4699. E-Mail: fyeuscc@univscvm.csd.scarolina.edu

Appendix B

Colleges and Universities Reporting Freshman Seminars-1994

Abilene Christian University	Abilene	TX
Adams State College	Alamosa	CO
Albertus Magnus College	New Haven	CT
Allan Hancock University	Santa Marta	CA
Allegheny College	Meadville	PA
Allen University	Columbia	SC
Alvernia College	Reading	PA
Alvin CC	Alvin	TX
Amarillo College	Amarillo	TX
American Indian College	Phoenix	AZ
American University of Puerto Rico	Bayamon	PR
Amherst College	Amherst	MA
Ana G. Mendez University System	Rio Piedras	PR
Anderson University	Anderson	IN
Andrews University	Berrien Springs	MI
Anoka-Ramsey CC	Coon Rapids	MN
Antioch College	Yellow Springs	OH
Appalachian State University	Boone	NC
Arizona State University	Tempe	AZ
Armstrong State College	Savannah	GA
Atlanta Christian College	East Point	GA
Atlantic Union College	South Lancaster	MA
Augsburg College	Minneapolis	MN
Augustana College	Rock Island	IL
Austin College	Sherman	TX
Austin Peay State University	Clarksville	TN
Averett College	Danville	VA

Azusa Pacific University	Azusa	CA
Baldwin Wallace College	Berea	OH
Barnard College	New York	NY
Barry University	Miami	FL
Barton College	Wilson	NC
Bay Path College	Longmeadow	MA
Baylor University	Waco	TX
Bellarmine College	Louisville	KY
Belmont Abbey College	Belmont	NC
Beloit College	Beloit	WI
Bemidji State University	Bemidji	MN
Benedictine College	Atchison	KS
Bentley College	Waltham	MA
Berry College	Mount Berry	GA
Bethany Lutheran College	Mankato	MN
Bethel College	Mishawaka	IN
Bethel College	St. Paul	MN
Bevill State CC	Sumiton	AL
Big Bend CC	Moses Lake	WA
Bishop State CC	Mobile	AL
Bloomsburg University	Bloomsburg	PA
Blue Ridge CC	Flat Rock	NC
Blue Ridge CC	Weyers Cave	VA
Bossier Parish CC	Bossier City	LA
Bradford College	Bradford	MA
Bradley University	Peoria	IL
Brandeis University	Waltham	MA
Brazosport College	Lake Jackson	TX
Brenau University	Gainesville	GA
Briar Cliff College	Sioux City	IA
Bridgewater State College	Bridgewater	MA
Broward CC	Fort Lauderdale	FL

Bryn Mawr College	Bryn Mawr	PA
Bucknell University	Lewisburg	PA
Buena Vista College	Storm Lake	IA
Bunker Hill CC	Boston	MA
Burlington County College	Pemberton	NJ
Butler University	Indianapolis	IN
CCAC Boyce Campus	Mauryville	PA
Cal. Poly. State Univ. - San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo	CA
Cal. State, Bakersfield	Bakersfield	CA
Cal. State, Chico	Chico	CA
Cal. State, Fullerton	Fullerton	CA
Cal. State, Hayward	Hayward	CA
Cal. State, Long Beach	Long Beach	CA
Cal. State, Stanislaus	Turlock	CA
Caldwell College	Caldwell	NJ
Cameron University	Lawton	OK
Campbellsville College	Campbellsville	KY
Canisius College	Buffalo	NY
Cape Cod CC	West Barnstable	MA
Carl Albert State College	Poteau	OK
Carleton College	Northfield	MN
Carnegie Mellon	Pittsburgh	PA
Carroll CC	Westminster	MD
Carson Newman College	Jefferson City	TN
Case Western Reserve University	Cleveland	OH
Catawba Valley CC	Hickory	NC
Catonsville CC	Baltimore	MD
Cedar Crest College	Allentown	PA
Central Baptist College	Conway	AR
Central Carolina CC	Sanford	NC
Central College	Pella	IA
Central Connecticut State University	New Britain	CT

Central Methodist College	Fayette	MO
Central Missouri State U.	Warrensburg	MO
Central Ohio Technical College	Newark	OH
Central Washington University	Ellensburg	WA
Central Wesleyan College	Central	SC
Central Wyoming College	Riverton	WY
Centralia College	Centralia	WA
Chaminade University	Honolulu	HI
Chapman Univ.	Orange	CA
Chemeketa CC	Salem	OR
Chesapeake College	Wye Mills	MD
Chestnut Hill College	Philadelphia	PA
Chipola Junior College	Marianna	FL
Chowan College	Murfreesboro	NC
Christendom College	Front Royal	VA
Christian Heritage College	El Cajon	CA
Cincinnati Bible College	Cincinnati	OH
Clarion University of Pennsylvania	Clarion	PA
Clark College	Vancouver	WA
Clarke College	Dubuque	IA
Clarkson University	Potsdam	NY
Clatsop CC	Astoria	OR
Clemson University	Clemson	SC
Cleveland State University	Cleveland	OH
Clinton CC	Plattsburgh	NY
Cogswell College North	Kirkland	WA
Coker College	Hartsville	SC
Colby CC	Colby	KS
Colby-Sawyer College	New London	NH
College Misericordia	Dallas	PA
College of Great Falls	Great Falls	MT
College of Lake County	Grayslake	IL

College of Mount Saint Vincent	Riverdale	NY
College of Mount St. Joseph	Cincinnati	OH
College of Notre Dame	Belmont	CA
College of St. Catherine	St. Paul	MN
College of St. Elizabeth	Morristown	NJ
College of St. Francis	Joliet	IL
College of Wooster	Wooster	OH
Colorado Northwestern CC	Rangely	CO
Columbia College	Chicago	IL
Columbia College	Columbia	MO
Columbia College	Columbia	SC
Columbia State CC	Columbia	TN
Columbus State CC	Columbus	OH
Concord College	Athens	WV
Concordia College	Ann Arbor	MI
Concordia College	Bronxville	NY
Concordia University	Mequon	WI
Connecticut College	New London	CT
Conners State College	Warner	OK
Cornell University	Ithaca	NY
Craven CC	New Bern	NC
Crowder College	Neosho	MO
Crown College	St. Bonifacius	MN
Cumberland County College	Vineland	NJ
Cuyahoga CC	Cleveland	OH
D'Youville College	Buffalo	NY
Dakota Wesleyan University	Mitchell	SD
Dartmouth College	Hanover	NH
Davidson College	Davidson	NC
Davis & Elkins College	Elkins	WV
De Anza College	Cupertino	CA
Dean College	Franklin	MA

Del Mar College	Corpus Christi	TX
Dickinson College	Carlisle	PA
Dominican College of San Rafael	San Rafael	CA
Dordt College	Sioux City	IA
Drake University	Des Moines	IA
Drury College	Springfield	MO
Dull Knife Memorial College	Lame Deer	MT
Durham Technical CC	Durham	NC
Dutchess CC	Poughkeepsie	NY
East Coast Bible College	Charlotte	NC
East Texas State University	Commerce	TX
Eastern Mennonite University	Harrisonburg	VA
Eastern Nazarene College	Quincy	MA
Eastern Oklahoma State College	Wilburton	OK
Eastern Shore CC	Melfa	VA
Eastern Washington University	Cheney	WA
Edgewood College	Madison	WI
Edison CC	Ft. Myers	FL
Elizabethtown College	Elizabethtown	PA
Elon College	Elon College	NC
Emmanuel College	Boston	MA
Emporia State University	Emporia	KS
Erskine College	Due West	SC
Essex County College	Newark	NJ
Evergreen State College	Olympia	WA
Fairleigh Dickinson University	Madison	NJ
Fayetteville State University	Fayetteville	NC
Felician College	Lodi	NJ
Ferrum College	Ferrum	VA
Finger Lakes CC	Canandaigua	NY
Flathead Valley CC	Kalispell	MT
Florida A & M University	Tallahassee	FL

Florida Baptist Theological College	Graceville	FL
Florida International University	Miami	FL
Florida State University	Tallahassee	FL
Floyd College	Rome	GA
Fontbonne College	St. Louis	MO
Foothill College	Los Altos Hills	CA
Fordham University	Bronx	NY
Fort Berthold CC	New Town	ND
Francis Marion Univ.	Florence	SC
Franciscan University of Steubenville	Steubenville	OH
Franklin Pierce College	Rindge	NH
Freed-Hardeman University	Henderson	TN
Gainesville College	Gainesville	GA
Garden City CC	Garden City	KS
Garland County CC	Hot Springs	AR
Garrett CC	McHenry	MD
Gaston College	Dallas	NC
Geneva College	Beaver Falls	PA
Georgetown College	Georgetown	KY
Georgia Southern University	Statesboro	GA
Georgia Southwestern	Americus	GA
Georgian Court College	Lakewood	NJ
Gettysburg College	Gettysburg	PA
Gogebic CC	Ironwood	MI
Goshen College	Goshen	IN
Grace College	Winona Lake	IN
Graceland College	Lamoni	IA
Grand Canyon University	Phoenix	AZ
Grays Harbor College	Aberdeen	WA
Gustavus Adolphus College	St. Peter	MN
Hannibal LaGrange College	Hannibal	MO
Hartwick College	Oneonta	NY

Hastings College	Hastings	NE
Haverford College	Haverford	PA
Hazard CC	Hazard	KY
Heartland CC	Bloomington	IL
Heidelberg College	Tiffin	OH
Henderson State University	Arkadelphia	AR
Herkimer County CC	Herkimer	NY
Hesser College	Manchester	NH
Highland CC	Freeport	IL
Hilbert College	Hamburg	NY
Hocking College	Nelsonville	OH
Holmes CC	Goodman	MS
Holy Cross College	Notre Dame	IN
Holy Names College	Oakland	CA
Hopkinsville CC	Hopkinsville	KY
Houghton College	Houghton	NY
Houston Baptist University	Houston	TX
Howard College	Big Spring	TX
Hudson Valley CC	Troy	NY
Huntington College	Huntington	IN
Hutchinson CC	Hutchinson	KS
Idaho State University	Pocatello	ID
Illinois Benedictine College	Lisle	IL
Illinois Valley CC	Oglesby	IL
Indian Hills CC	Ottumwa	IA
Indiana Inst. of Technology	Fort Wayne	IN
Indiana U. - Purdue U. Indianapolis	Indianapolis	IN
Indiana University, Southeast	New Albany	IN
Inter American University	San Juan	PR
Inver Hills CC	Invergrove Heights	MN
Iona College	New Rochelle	NY
Iowa Wesleyan College	Mt. Pleasant	IA

Isothermal CC	Spindale	NC
Ithaca College	Ithaca	NY
Ivy Tech State College	Lafayette	IN
Ivy Tech State College	Muncie	IN
Jackson State CC	Jackson	TN
Jackson State University	Jackson	MS
Jacksonville State University	Jacksonville	AL
James Sprunt CC	Kenansville	NC
Jamestown CC	Jamestown	NY
Jefferson CC	Watertown	NY
Jefferson State CC	Birmingham	AL
John Jay College	New York	NY
John Wood CC	Quincy	IL
Johnson & Wales University	Providence	RI
Joliet Junior College	Joliet	IL
Jones Jr. College	Ellisville	MS
Juniata College	Huntington	PA
Kansas State University	Manhattan	KS
Kean College	Union	NJ
Kellogg CC	Battle Creek	MI
Kennesaw State University	Marietta	GA
Kent State University, Astabula	Astabula	OH
Kent State University, East Liverpool	East Liverpool	OH
Kent State University, Salem	Salem	OH
Kent State University, Tuscarawas	New Philadelphia	OH
King's College	Wilkes-Barre	PA
Kingsborough CC of CUNY	Brooklyn	NY
Knox College	Galesburg	IL
Lafayette College	Easton	PA
Lake City CC	Lake City	FL
Lake Land College	Mattoon	IL
Lakeland College	Sheboygan	WI

Lakeshore Technical College	Cleveland	WI
Lander University	Greenwood	SC
Lane College	Jackson	TN
Lawrence University	Appleton	WI
Lebanon Valley College	Annville	PA
Lee College	Baytown	TX
Lees College	Jackson	KY
Lees McRae College	Banner Elk	NC
Lemoyne-Owen College	Memphis	TN
Lenoir Rhyne College	Hickory	NC
Lewis and Clark College	Portland	OR
Lexington CC	Lexington	KY
Liberty University	Lynchburg	VA
Limestone College	Gaffney	SC
Lincoln Land CC	Springfield	IL
Lincoln University	Jefferson City	MO
Lindenwood College	St. Charles	MO
Linfield College	McMinnville	OR
Lock Haven University	Lock Haven	PA
Long Island University, C. W. Post Camp.	Brookville	NY
Longwood College	Farmville	VA
Loras College	Dubuque	IA
Louisburg College	Louisburg	NC
Lubbock Christian University	Lubbock	TX
Lurleen B. Wallace State Jr. College	Andalusia	AL
Lutheran College	Fort Wayne	IN
Lyndon State College	Lyndonville	VT
Macon College	Macon	GA
Madisonville CC	Madisonville	KY
Madonna University	Livonia	MI
Maine Maritime Academy	Castine	ME
Manchester College	North Manchester	IN

Mankato State University	Mankato	MN
Maranatha Baptist Bible College	Watertown	WI
Marian College	Indianapolis	IN
Marietta College	Marietta	OH
Marlboro College	Marlboro	VT
Mars Hill College	Mars Hill	NC
Martin CC	Williamstown	NC
Martin University	Indianapolis	IN
Marygrove College	Detroit	MI
Marymount College	Rancho Palos Verdes	CA
Marymount University	Arlington	VA
Maryville College	Maryville	TN
McMurry University	Abilene	TX
Medaille College	Buffalo	NY
Medgar Evers College	Brooklyn	NY
Mercer County CC	Trenton	NJ
Mercer University	Macon	GA
Meridian College	Meridian	MS
Merrimack College	North Andover	MA
Messiah College	Grantham	PA
Metro CC	Omaha	NE
Metropolitan State University	St. Paul	MN
Miami-Dade CC	Miami	FL
Michigan State University	East Lansing	MI
Mid-America Nazarene College	Olathe	KS
Middle Georgia College	Cochran	GA
Middle Tennessee State University	Murfreesboro	TN
Middlebury College	Middlebury	VT
Middlesex Community Tech College	Middletown	CT
Milligan College	Milligan College	TN
Mills College	Oakland	CA
Millsaps College	Jackson	MS

Milwaukee Institute of Art and Design	Milwaukee	WI
Minneapolis Community College	Minneapolis	MN
Minot State University	Minot	ND
Mississippi Gulf Coast CC	Gulfport	MS
Mississippi State University	Mississippi State	MS
Mississippi University for Women	Columbus	MS
Missouri Baptist College	St. Louis	MO
Missouri Southern State College	Joplin	MO
Mitchell CC	Statesville	NC
Mitchell College	New London	CT
Mitchell Technical Institute	Mitchell	SD
Moberly Area CC	Moberly	MO
Mohawk Valley CC	Utica	NY
Molloy College	Rockville Centre	NY
Monmouth College	Long Branch	NJ
Montana State University-Billings	Billings	MT
Montgomery College	Germantown	MD
Montgomery County CC	Blue Bell	PA
Moore College of Art & Studio Design	Philadelphia	PA
Moorpark College	Moorpark	CA
Moraine Valley CC	Palos Hills	IL
Moravian College	Bethlehem	PA
Morehead State University	Morehead	KY
Morningside College	Sioux City	IA
Motlow State CC	Tullahoma	TN
Mount Ida College	Newton Center	MA
Mount Mary College	Milwaukee	WI
Mount Olive College	Mount Olive	NC
Mount Saint Mary's College	Emmitsburg	MD
Mount St. Mary's College	Los Angeles	CA
Muscatine CC	Muscatine	IA
N.C. Central University	Durham	NC

National College	Rapid City	SD
Nazareth College	Rochester	NY
Neosho County CC	Chanute	KS
New England College	Henniker	NH
New Mexico State University	Las Cruces	NM
New River CC	Dublin	VA
New York Institute of Technology	Old Westbury	NY
North Adams State College	North Adams	MA
North Central Bible College	Minneapolis	MN
North Dakota State University	Fargo	ND
North Florida Junior College	Madison	FL
North Greenville College	Tigerville	SC
North Lake College	Irving	TX
Northeast MO State Univ	Kirksville	MO
Northeast State Technical CC	Blountville	TN
Northeastern Okla A & M College	Miami	OK
Northeastern Oklahoma State U. Okmulgee	Okmulgee	OK
Northern Arizona University	Flagstaff	AZ
Northern Illinois University	DeKalb	IL
Northern Kentucky University	Highland Heights	KY
Northern State University	Aberdeen	SD
Northland College	Ashland	WI
Northwest college	Powell	WY
Northwestern Business College	Chicago	IL
Northwestern College	Orange City	IA
Northwestern College	St. Paul	MN
Northwood University	Midland	MI
Nyack College	Nyack	NY
Oakton CC	Des Plaines	IL
Odessa College	Odessa	TX
Ohio Northern University	Ada	OH
Ohio State University	Columbus	OH

Ohio State University, Agri. Tech. Inst.	Wooster	OH
Ohio University, Chillicothe	Chillicothe	OH
Ohio University, Lancaster	Lancaster	OH
Ohio University, Zanesville	Zanesville	OH
Oklahoma Baptist University	Shawnee	OK
Oklahoma City University	Oklahoma City	OK
Oklahoma Panhandle State University	Goodwell	OK
Oklahoma State University	Oklahoma City	OK
Olivet Nazarene University	Kankakee	IL
Oral Roberts University	Tulsa	OK
Orange County CC	Middletown	NY
Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College	Orangeburg	SC
Oregon Institute of Technology	Kiamath Falls	OR
Oregon State University	Corvallis	OR
Ottawa University	Ottawa	KS
Our Lady of the Lake University	San Antonio	TX
Owensboro CC	Owensboro	KY
Pace University	New York	NY
Pacific Northwest College of Art	Portland	OR
Pacific University	Forest Grove	OR
Parkland College	Champaign	IL
Pembroke State University	Pembroke	NC
Penn State Erie Behrend College	Erie	PA
Penn State Worthington Scranton	Dunmore	PA
Penn State York	York	PA
Pensacola Junior College	Pensacola	FL
Pepperdine University	Malibu	CA
Peru State College	Peru	NE
Philadelphia College of Bible	Langhorne	PA
Philadelphia College of Pharmacy & Scien	Philadelphia	PA
Piedmont College	Demorest	GA
Piedmont Technical College	Greenwood	SC

Pillsbury College	Owatonna	MN
Pittsburg State University	Pittsburg	KS
Plymouth State College	Plymouth	NH
Polytechnic University	Brooklyn	NY
Pontifical Catholic Univ. of Puerto Rico	Ponce	PR
Prairie State College	Chicago Heights	IL
Princeton University	Princeton	NJ
Purchase College, SUNY	Purchase	NY
Purdue University	West Lafayette	IN
Purdue University Calumet	Hammond	IN
Quinsigamond CC	Worcester	MA
Ramapo College of NJ	Mahwah	NJ
Randolph Macon College	Ashland	VA
Ranken Tech. CC	St. Louis	MO
Rhode Island College	Providence	RI
Ricks College	Rexburg	ID
Riverside CC	Riverside	CA
Rivier College	Nashua	NH
Roane State CC	Harriman	TN
Rochester Institute of Technology	Rochester	NY
Roger Williams University	Bristol	RI
Rollins College	Winter Park	FL
Rosemont College	Rosemont	PA
Roxbury CC	Boston	MA
Russell Sage College	Troy	NY
S. W. Indian Polytechnic Inst.	Alb	NM
SUNY, Binghamton	Binghamton	NY
SUNY, College at Brockport	Brockport	NY
SUNY, College at Old Westbury	Old Westbury	NY
SUNY, College of Environ. Sci & Forestry	Syracuse	NY
SUNY, Delhi	Delhi	NY
SUNY, Maritime College	Bronx	NY

SUNY, New Paltz	New Paltz	NY
SUNY, Oneonta	Oneonta	NY
SUNY, Oswego	Oswego	NY
SUNY, Stony Brook	Stony Brook	NY
Sacred Heart University	Fairfield	CT
Saint Francis College	Loretto	PA
Saint Mary's College of Minnesota	Winona	MN
Saint Xavier University	Chicago	IL
Salem College	Winston-Salem	NC
Salem State College	Salem	MA
Salt Lake CC	Salt Lake City	UT
Salve Regina University	Newport	RI
San Antonio College	San Antonio	TX
San Bernardino Valley College	San Bernardino	CA
San Diego Mesa College	San Diego	CA
San Diego Miramar College	San Diego	CA
Santa Fe CC	Santa Fe	NM
Savannah College of Art & Design	Savannah	GA
Scripps College	Claremont	CA
Seattle University	Seattle	WA
Seton Hill College	Greensburg	PA
Shelby State CC	Memphis	TN
Sheldon Jackson College	Sitka	AK
Shippensburg University	Shippensburg	PA
Shorter College	Rome	GA
Sienna Heights College	Adrian	MI
Simpson College	Indianola	IA
Simpson College	Redding	CA
Sinclair CC	Dayton	OH
Slippery Rock Univ.	Slippery Rock	PA
Snow College	Ephraim	UT
Sonoma State University	Donhert Park	CA

South Carolina State Univ.	Orangeburg	SC
South Dakota State University	Brookings	SD
Southeast CC	Cumberland	KY
Southeastern Louisiana University	Hammond	LA
Southern Arkansas University	Magnolia	AR
Southern CC	Whiteville	NC
Southern College	Orlando	FL
Southern Illinois Univ. at Edwardsville	Edwardsville	IL
Southern Maine Technical College	South Portland	ME
Southern Union State CC	Opelika	AL
Southern University at New Orleans	New Orleans	LA
Southern Vermont College	Bennington	VT
Southwest Baptist University	Bolivar	MO
Southwest Missouri State University	Springfield	MO
Southwest State University	Marshall	MN
Southwest Virginia CC	Richlands	VA
Southwestern Oklahoma State Univ.	Weatherford	OK
Southwestern CC	Creston	IA
Southwestern CC	Sylva	NC
Southwestern Christian College	Terrell	TX
Spartan School of Aeronautics	Tulsa	OK
Spartanburg Methodist College	Spartanburg	SC
Spelman College	Atlanta	GA
Spring Arbor College	Spring Arbor	MI
Spring Hill College	Mobile	AL
St. Ambrose University	Davenport	IA
St. Catherine College	St. Catherine	KY
St. Charles CC	St. Peters	MO
St. Cloud State University	St. Cloud	MN
St. Edward's University	Austin	TX
St. John Fisher College	Rochester	NY
St. John's College	Annapolis	MD

St. John's River CC	Palatka	FL
St. Joseph's College	West Hartford	CT
St. Lawrence University	Canton	NY
St. Louis CC at Florissant Valley	St. Louis	MO
St. Martins College	Laery	WA
St. Mary College	Leavenworth	KS
St. Mary's College	Orchard Lake	MI
St. Norbert College	De Pere	WI
St. Olaf College	Northfield	MN
St. Paul's College	Lawrenceville	VA
St. Petersburg Junior College	St. Petersburg	FL
St. Phillips College	San Antonio	TX
St. Thomas University	Miami	FL
Stephen F. Austin State Univ.	Nacogdoches	TX
Stephens College	Columbia	MO
Sterling College	Sterling	KS
Stevens Institute of Technology	Hoboken	NJ
Suffolk CC	Brentwood	NY
Suffolk University	Boston	MA
Susquehanna University	Selinsgrove	PA
Sussex Community College	Newton	NJ
Syracuse University	Syracuse	NY
Tabor College	Hillsboro	KS
Tacoma CC	Tacoma	WA
Taft College	Taft	CA
Tallahassee CC	Tallahassee	FL
Taylor University	Upland	IN
Taylor University, Fort Wayne	Fort Wayne	IN
Teikyo Marycrest University	Davenport	IA
Tennessee State University	Nashville	TN
Tennessee Wesleyan College	Athens	TN
Texas A & M University	College Station	TX

Texas A & M University, Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi	TX
Texas A & M University, Kingsville	Kingsville	TX
Texas Lutheran College	Seguin	TX
Texas Tech. University	Lubbock	TX
The King's College	Briarcliff Manor	NY
Three Rivers CC	Poplar Bluff	MO
Towson State University	Towson	MD
Transylvania University	Lexington	KY
Trenton State College	Trenton	NJ
Trident Technical College	Charleston	SC
Trinity Bible College	Ellendale	ND
Trinity College	Hartford	CT
Trinity College	Washington	DC
Triton College	River Grove	IL
Trocaire College	Buffalo	NY
Tusculum College	Greeneville	TN
Tuskegee University	Tuskegee Institute	AL
U. S. Military Academy	West Point	NY
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	New London	CT
U.S. Naval Academy	Annapolis	Md
Union College	Lincoln	NE
Union College	Schenectady	NY
Univ. of Akron	Akron	OH
Univ. of Akron, Wayne College	Akron	OH
Univ. of Alabama, Birmingham	Birmingham	AL
Univ. of Alabama, Birmingham,Walker C.	Jasper	AL
Univ. of Arizona	Tucson	AZ
Univ. of Arkansas, Fayetteville	Fayetteville	AR
Univ. of California, Davis	Davis	CA
Univ. of California, Los Angeles	Los Angeles	CA
Univ. of California, San Diego	La Jolla	CA
Univ. of California, Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	CA

Univ. of Central Florida	Orlando	FL
Univ. of Charleston	Charleston	WV
Univ. of Colorado, Denver	Denver	CO
Univ. of Findlay	Findlay	OH
Univ. of Hawaii, Manoa	Honolulu	HI
Univ. of Houston	Houston	TX
Univ. of Illinois Urbana-Champaign	Champaign	IL
Univ. of Kansas	Lawrence	KS
Univ. of Kentucky	Lexington	KY
Univ. of Louisville	Louisville	KY
Univ. of Maine, Augusta	Augusta	ME
Univ. of Maine, Fort Kent	Fort Kent	ME
Univ. of Mary Hardin - Baylor	Belton	TX
Univ. of Maryland	College Park	MD
Univ. of Massachusetts, Dartmouth	North Dartmouth	MA
Univ. of Miami	Coral Gables	FL
Univ. of Michigan	Ann Arbor	MI
Univ. of Michigan, Flint	Flint	MI
Univ. of Mississippi	University	MS
Univ. of Missouri	Columbia	MO
Univ. of Missouri, Rolla	Rolla	MO
Univ. of New Haven	New Haven	CT
Univ. of New Orleans	New Orleans	LA
Univ. of North Carolina, Charlotte	Charlotte	NC
Univ. of North Carolina, Wilmington	Wilmington	NC
Univ. of North Dakota	Grand Forks	ND
Univ. of North Texas	Denton	TX
Univ. of Northern Colorado	Greeley	CO
Univ. of Notre Dame	Notre Dame	IN
Univ. of Oklahoma	Norman	OK
Univ. of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	PA
Univ. of Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh	PA

Univ. of Pittsburgh, Bradford	Bradford	PA
Univ. of Portland	Portland	OR
Univ. of Puerto Rico, Humacao	Humacao	PR
Univ. of Richmond	Richmond	VA
Univ. of Rio Grande	Rio Grande	OH
Univ of San Francisco	San Francisco	CA
Univ. of South Carolina	Columbia	SC
Univ. of South Carolina, Salkehatchie	Allendale	SC
Univ. of South Carolina, Sumter	Sumter	SC
Univ. of South Carolina, Union	Union	SC
Univ. of South Florida	Tampa	FL
Univ. of St. Thomas	Houston	TX
Univ. of Tennessee, Chattanooga	Chattanooga	TN
Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville	Knoxville	TN
Univ. of Texas - Permian Basin	Odessa	TX
Univ. of Texas, Austin	Austin	TX
Univ. of Texas, Brownsville	Brownsville	TX
Univ. of Texas, San Antonio	San Antonio	TX
Univ. of Toledo	Toledo	OH
Univ. of Vermont	Burlington	VT
Univ. of Virginia	Charlottesville	VA
Univ. of West Florida	Pensacola	FL
Univ. of Wisconsin, Green Bay	Green Bay	WI
Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison	Madison	WI
Univ. of Wisconsin, Oshkosh	Oshkosh	WI
Univ. of Wisconsin, Whitewater	Whitewater	WI
University of North Alabama	Florence	AL
Upper Iowa University	Fayette	IA
Ursinus College	Collegeville	PA
Ursuline College	Pepper Pike	OH
Utica College of Syracuse University	Utica	NY
Valencia CC	Orlando	FL

Valley City State University	Valley City	ND
Valparaiso University	Valparaiso	IN
Vanderbilt University	Nashville	TN
Vassar College	Poughkeepsie	NY
Vermont Technical College	Randolph Center	VT
Villanova University	Villanova	PA
Virginia Commonwealth University	Richmond	VA
Volunteer State CC	Gallatin	TN
Waldorf College	Forest City	IA
Warner Southern College	Lake Wales	FL
Wartburg College	Waverly	IA
Washburn University	Topeka	KS
Washington & Jefferson College	Washington	PA
Washington College	Chestertown	MD
Washington State CC	Marietta	OH
Washington State University	Pullman	WA
Waycross College	Waycross	GA
Wayne State College	Wayne	NE
Wayne State University	Detroit	MI
Weber State University	Ogden	UT
Webster University	St. Louis	MO
Wesleyan University	Middletown	CT
West Texas A & M University	Canyon	TX
West Virginia Northern CC	Wheeling	WV
West Virginia State College	Institute	WV
West Virginia University, Parkersburg	Parkersburg	WV
Westchester CC	Valhalla	NY
Western Carolina University	Cullowhee	NC
Western Dakota Technical Institute	Rapid City	SD
Western Maryland College	Westminster	MD
Western Michigan University	Kalamazoo	MI
Western Piedmont CC	Morganton	NC

Western State College	Gunnison	CO
Western Texas College	Snyder	TX
Western Wyoming CC	Rock Springs	WY
Westminster College	Fulton	MO
Whatcom CC	Bellingham	WA
Wheaton College	Wheaton	IL
Wheeling Jesuit College	Wheeling	WV
Wheelock College	Boston	MA
Whittier College	Whittier	CA
Whitworth College	Spokane	WA
Wichita State University	Wichita	KS
Widener University	Chester	PA
William Jewel College	Liberty	MO
William Paterson College of NJ	Wayne	NJ
William Woods University	Fulton	MO
Wilmington College	Wilmington	OH
Winthrop University	Rock Hill	SC
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College	Shell Lake	WI
Wofford College	Spartanburg	SC
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Worcester	MA
Worthington CC	Worthington	MN
Wytheville CC	Wytheville	VA
Xavier University	Cincinnati	OH
Yakima Valley CC	Yakima	WA
York Technical College	Rock Hill	SC

REFERENCES

American College Testing Program. (1991). *ACT institutional data file.* Iowa City: Author.

American Council on Education. 1995). *Campus trends.* Washington, DC: Author.

Astin, A. (1977a). *Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. (1977b). *Preventing students from dropping out.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A.(1984).Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25,* 297-307.

Astin, A. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Barefoot, B. (1992). *Exploring the evidence: Reporting outcomes of freshman seminars* (Monograph No. 11). Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience, University of South Carolina.

Boyer, E. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America.* New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Campus life: In search of community.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E., & Levine, A. (1981). *A quest for common learning.* Washington, DC: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. (1995, September 8). A new approach to ease the way for freshmen. (pp. A57 - A58).

Fidler, P. (1991). Relationship of freshman orientation seminars to sophomore return rates. *Journal of The Freshman Year Experience, 3*(1), 7-38.

Fitts, C. T., & Swift, F. H. (1928). The construction of orientation courses for college freshmen. *University of California Publications in Education, 1897-1929, 2*(3), 145-250.

Gordon, V. (1989). Origins and purposes of the freshman seminar. In M. L. Upcraft & J. N. Gardner (Eds.), *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college* (pp. 183-198). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gordon, V. (1991). The evolution of a freshman seminar course: A case study. *Journal of the Freshman Year Experience,* 3(2), pp. 107-117.

Levine, A. (1985). *Handbook of undergraduate curriculum.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A., & Weingart, J. (1974). *Reform of undergraduate education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mayhew, L., Ford, P., & Hubbard, D. (1990). *The quest for quality: The challenge for undergraduate education in the 1990s.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience. (1988, 1991, 1994). *National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina.

Pace, R. (1984). *Measuring the quality of college student experiences.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.

Rudolph, F. (1977). *Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sanford, N. (1969). *Where colleges fail: A study of the student as a person.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sanford, N. (1988). Foreword. In J. M. Whiteley & N. Yokota, *Character development in the freshman year and over four years of undergraduate study* (Monograph No. 1) (pp. 3-9). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V., & Goodsell, A. (1994). Freshman interest groups and the first-year experience: Constructing student communities in a large university. *Journal of The Freshman Year Experience,* 6(1), 7-28.

Van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage* (M. Vizadon & G. Caffee, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.